arXiv:1601.05169v4 [math.DG] 17 May 2016

Gluing scalar-flat manifolds with vanishing mean curvature on the boundary

Demetre Kazaras

Department of Mathematics, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1222 USA

Abstract

We establish a gluing theorem for solutions of a Yamabe problem for manifolds with boundary studied by J. Escobar in the mid 90's. We begin with two compact Riemannian manifolds with boundary, each scalar-flat, of vanishing boundary mean curvature, and equipped with a common submanifold K. Under suitable geometric conditions, we produce a 1-parameter family of metrics on the generalized connect sum along K, each of vanishing scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature. Assuming an extra non-degeneracy hypothesis, we can arrange for these metrics to have vanishing boundary mean curvature. Moreover, these metrics converge to the original metrics away from the gluing site in the C^2 topology.

Keywords: The Yamabe problem, Boundary value problem, Surgery
2010 MSC: 53A10, 53A30, 53C21, 57R65, 58J32

1. Introduction

Given a closed n-dimensional manifold M and a conformal class C, the classical Yamabe problem asks if there is a metric in C of constant scalar curvature. Such metrics are critical points of the Einstein-Hilbert functional

$$C \to \mathbb{R}, \quad g \mapsto \frac{\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \int_M R_g d\mu_g}{\mathrm{Vol}_g(M)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}$$

restricted to the class C. See section 1 for a description of our notation. When the solution of this problem [12] was nearly a decade old, J. Escobar introduced generalizations to compact manifolds M with non-empty boundary ∂M. The natural functional to consider in the context of a boundary is the *total scalar curvature plus total mean curvature* [2]. In order to make this quantity scale-invariant, it must be renormalized. In the case of the classical Yamabe problem this is accomplished by dividing the total scalar curvature by $\mathrm{Vol}_g(M)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}$. For manifolds with boundary, however, one may choose to renormalize with respect to the volume of the interior, the boundary, or a combination of the two.

Email address: demetre@uoregon.edu (Demetre Kazaras)

In [6], Escobar studies the following family of functionals

$$C \to \mathbb{R}, \quad g \mapsto \frac{\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} \int_M R_g d\mu_g + \frac{n-2}{2(n-1)} \int_{\partial M} H_g d\sigma_g}{a\mathrm{Vol}_g(M)^{\frac{n-2}{n}} + (1-a)\mathrm{Vol}_g(\partial M)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}}$$

where a is a fixed number in the interval $[0, 1]$. For any value of a, critical points of this functional are metrics of constant scalar curvature with constant mean curvature on the boundary. For $a = 1$, critical points are scalar-flat and for $a = 0$ critical points have vanishing mean curvature on the boundary. These extremal cases are studied, respectively, in [4] and [6] where critical points are found for a large class of M and C. Notice that scalar-flat metrics with vanishing mean curvature on the boundary are critical points of this functional for any value of a. Conformal classes which contain such metrics are called *Yamabe-null*.



Figure 1: Schematic description of the generalized connected sum for (from left) an interior, boundary, and relative embedding.

In this paper we determine to what extent two Yamabe-null manifolds with boundary may be glued along a common submanifold to produce a third Yamabe-null manifold. Gluing constructions have a rich and storied history in geometric analysis, too extensive to satisfactorily survey here. For our construction, we will adopt a particular scheme introduced by L. Mazzieri in [10] for gluing closed manifolds with non-zero constant scalar curvature. His work generalizes results of D. Joyce [7] on connected sums of closed manifolds of non-zero constant scalar curvature (see also [9]). In [11] Mazzieri considers the more delicate problem of gluing two closed Yamabe-null manifolds to produce another manifold of vanishing scalar curvature. In general, this process may be obstructed if one of the two original manifolds is Ricci-flat. In the present paper we encounter a similar obstruction which, naturally, involves the second fundamental form of the original manifolds' boundaries – obstructors to our process can be identified as Ricci-flat manifolds with totally geodesic boundary. Our construction is flexible enough to also glue

along submanifolds which themselves have boundary meeting the ambient boundary orthogonally. This requires a new geometric construction and we naturally encounter a family of elliptic problems with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann boundary conditions for which we must provide new a priori estimates.

Let us describe the main result, first in the case where gluing occurs along a submanifold embedded away from the boundary which we call an *interior embedding*. Let (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) be n-dimensional compact manifolds which are scalar-flat and have vanishing boundary mean curvatures. Moreover, suppose that each is equipped with an isometric embedding of a closed k-dimensional manifold (K, g_K), denoted by $\iota_* : K \to \mathring{M}_*$ $(* = 1, 2)$. Assuming that the isometry $\iota_1 \circ \iota_2^{-1}$ extends to an isomorphism of the normal bundles of K, we may form $M := M_1 \#_K M_2$, the generalized connected sum along K by removing small tubular neighborhoods and using the bundle isomorphism to identify annular regions (see Figure 1). In sections 2 and 3, we begin by producing and studying a 1-parameter family of metrics g_ε on M transitioning between g_1 and g_2 on a neighborhood of the surgery site. The metrics g_ε can be thought of as attaching M_1 and M_2 by a thin, short K-shaped tube which becomes thinner as ε decreases. This family serves as a starting point for an iterative construction described in sections 4 and 5 which produces a family of metrics conformal to g_ε, each scalar flat and of constant boundary mean curvature. More formally, we prove the following.

Theorem 1_a. *Let (M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2) be compact n-dimensional manifolds with non-empty boundaries. Assume that*

$$R_{g_1} \equiv 0, \;\; H_{g_1} \equiv 0, \;\; R_{g_2} \equiv 0, \;\; H_{g_2} \equiv 0, \;\; \textit{and} \;\; \mathrm{Vol}_{g_1}(\partial M_1) = \mathrm{Vol}_{g_2}(\partial M_2).$$

Given isometric embeddings $\iota_1 : K \to \mathring{M}_1$, $\iota_2 : K \to \mathring{M}_2$ of a closed k-dimensional manifold (K, g_K) of codimension $m := n - k \geq 3$ with isomorphic normal bundles, there exists a family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}$ (for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$) on $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ with constant boundary mean curvature

$$|H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}| = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

Moreover, for each ε, $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ is conformal to g_* away from a fixed tubular neighborhood of $\iota_*(K)$ in M_* and $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon \to g_*$ on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.

The above codimension restriction allows spheres in fibers of the normal bundles to carry curvature, which will be required in our construction. If neither of the original manifolds (M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2) are Ricci-flat with vanishing second fundamental form of the boundary, more can be accomplished – we may alter this construction in an ε-small non-conformal manner, so that the resulting metrics have vanishing boundary mean curvature.

Theorem 2_a. *Assume, in addition to the conditions in Theorem 1_a, that both manifolds (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) are not Ricci-flat with vanishing second fundamental form of their boundaries. Then there exists a second family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\hat{g}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}$ on $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ with vanishing boundary mean curvature. Moreover, $\hat{g}_\varepsilon \to g_*$ on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.*

As mentioned earlier, we additionally consider gluing along boundaries i.e. when the embedding of K has a non-trivial intersection with ∂M_1 and ∂M_2. Carrying out the construction in this case requires substantial changes and new estimates which are contained in sections 2 and 3. It is convenient to break into two further cases: that in which K is closed and embedded into the

boundaries ∂M_* and that in which K itself has a boundary ∂K with $\mathring{K}$ and ∂K embedded into $\mathring{M}_*$ and ∂M_*, respectively. We will refer to the former as a *boundary embedding* and the latter as a *relative embedding*.

For boundary embeddings, we naturally require that the isometry $\iota_2 \circ \iota_1^{-1}$ extends to an isomorphism of the boundary normal bundles $\mathcal{N}(\iota_*(K)) \subset T\partial M_*$. Under this assumption, there is well-defined boundary connected sum along K, still denoted by $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$, see Section 2.2 for details.

Theorem 1_b. *Let (M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2) be as in Theorem 1_a and suppose (K, g_K) is a closed manifold with isometric embeddings $\iota_1 : K \to \partial M_1$, $\iota_2 : K \to \partial M_2$ with $m = n - k \geq 3$. Assume that $\iota_2 \circ \iota_1^{-1}$ extends to an isomorphism of the normal bundles $\mathcal{N}(\iota_*(K)) \subset T\partial M_*$. Then there exists a family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)}$ with constant boundary mean curvature $H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$. Moreover, the metrics $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ are conformal to g_* away from a fixed tubular neighborhood of $\iota_*(K)$ in M_* and converge to the original metrics on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.*

Theorem 2_b. *Assume, in addition to the conditions in Theorem 1_b, that both manifolds (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) are not Ricci-flat with vanishing second fundamental form of their boundaries. Then there exists a second family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\hat{g}\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)}$ on $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ with vanishing boundary mean curvature. Moreover, $\hat{g}_\varepsilon \to g_*$ on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.*

The construction for a relative embedding, however, is a bit more delicate and we require additional assumptions on the embeddings ι_*.

Definition 1. We say that the isometric embeddings $\iota_* : K \to M_*$, $* = 1, 2$, are *surgery-ready* if

(i) ι_* is a proper embedding, i.e., $\iota_*(\mathring{K}) \subset \mathring{M}_*$ and $\iota_*(\partial K) \subset \partial M_*$;

(ii) there is a neighborhood, $V \subset K$, of ∂K such that the embedding $\iota_*(K)$ agrees with the g_*-exponential map on $\iota_*(\partial K)$ (see Figure 5);

(iii) the map $\iota_2 \circ \iota_1^{-1}$ extends to an isomorphism of the normal bundles $\mathcal{N}_1(K)$, $\mathcal{N}_2(K)$ which restricts to an isomorphism of the boundary normal bundles $\mathcal{N}_1(\partial K)$, $\mathcal{N}_2(\partial K)$.

Assuming the embeddings $\iota_* : K \to M_*$ are surgery-ready, there is a well-defined generalized connected sum $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ along K, see Section 2.3 for details. Precisely, we have the following pair of theorems.

Theorem 1_c. *Let (M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2) be as in Theorem 1_a and (K, g_K) be a compact manifold with boundary. Assume $\iota_1 : K \to M_1$, $\iota_2 : K \to M_2$ are surgery ready isometric embeddings as above with $m = n - k \geq 3$. Then there exists a family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)}$ on $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ with constant boundary mean curvature $H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$. Moreover, the metrics $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ are conformal to g_* away from a fixed tubular neighborhood of $\iota_*(K)$ in M_* and converge to the original metrics on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.*

Theorem 2_c. *Assume, in addition to the conditions in Theorem 1_c, that both manifolds (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) are not Ricci-flat with vanishing second fundamental form of their boundaries. Then there exists a second family of scalar-flat metrics $\{\hat{g}_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)}$ on $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ with vanishing boundary mean curvature. Moreover, $\hat{g}_\varepsilon \to g_*$ on compact sets of $M_* \setminus \iota_*(K)$ in the C^2 topology as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for $* = 1, 2$.*

Before we begin, the author would like to thank his Ph.D. adviser, Prof. Boris Botvinnik for suggesting this problem as well as Prof. Micah Warren for a number of helpful conversations.

2. The Yamabe problem for manifolds with boundary

Let us introduce the objects and notations we will require. For a smooth Riemannian n-dimensional manifold (M, g) with boundary ∂M, we will write Ric_g for its Ricci tensor and A_g for the second fundamental form of the boundary with respect to the outward unit normal vector ν. The scalar curvature of (M, g) is given by $R_g = tr_g Ric_g$ and its boundary mean curvature is $H_g = tr_g A_g$. Notice that H_g is the sum of the principle curvatures at a point $p \in \partial M$, as opposed to their average (usually denoted by h_g) which is used in Escobar's original work [4][5][6].

A metric $\tilde{g}$ is said to be *conformal* to g if there is a smooth positive function f so that $\tilde{g} = fg$. The equivalence class of metrics conformal to g will be denoted by $[g]$. We will often write the conformal factor in the form $f = \psi^{\frac{4}{n-2}}$. Writing $c_n = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}$, the scalar curvature of $\tilde{g} = \psi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ is given by

$$R_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{L_g \psi}{c_n \psi^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}}$$

where L_g is the conformal Laplacian $L_g = -\Delta_g + c_n R_g$. The mean curvature of the boundary with respect to $\tilde{g}$ is given by

$$H_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{B_g \psi}{2c_n \psi^{\frac{n}{n-2}}}$$

where the first-order boundary operator B_g is given by $B_g = \partial_\nu + 2c_n H_g$ on ∂M.

In [4] Escobar studied and answered the following question: Does a given conformal class $[g]$ contain a scalar-flat metric with constant boundary mean curvature? In light of the above formula, this task is equivalent to solving the following elliptic problem with non-linear boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g \psi = c_n R_g \psi & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu \psi = 2c_n (Q\psi^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - H_g \psi) & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where Q is a constant. If ψ is a smooth solution to (1), then $\tilde{g} = \psi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ will have vanishing scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature λ. As mentioned above, equation (1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation for the total scalar curvature plus total mean curvature functional (cf. [2]), renormalized with respect to the volume of the boundary. In terms of the conformal factor ψ, this functional takes the form

$$Q(\psi) = \frac{\int_M (|\nabla \psi|_g^2 + c_n R_g \psi^2) d\mu_g + 2c_n \int_{\partial M} H_g \psi^2 d\sigma_g}{(\int_{\partial M} |\psi|^{\frac{2(n-1)}{n-2}} d\sigma)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}}}$$

where $d\mu_g$ and $d\sigma_g$ denote the Riemannian measure on M and ∂M induced by g.

3. Construction of g_ε and the local a priori estimate

In this section, we construct the generalized connected sum $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$ and define a family of metrics $\{g_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})}$ on M. At this point, it is convenient to consider the cases of interior, boundary, and relative embeddings separately. The next step is to give pointwise and integral

estimates for the scalar and boundary mean curvatures of the new metrics $\{g_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon\in(0,\frac{1}{2})}$ cf. Propositions 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c. Finally, we study the family of operators Δ_{g_ε}, giving a local a priori estimate for solutions of the Δ_{g_ε}-Poisson equation cf. Propositions 2_a, 2_b, and 2_c.

In section 2.1 we describe the process for interior embeddings, revisiting the construction in [10]. In this case, the g_*-exponential map identifies, for some small $r > 0$, the distance neighborhood

$$V_*^r := \{y \in M_* \colon \operatorname{dist}_{g_*}(y, \iota_*(K)) < r\}$$

with the portion of the normal bundle $\{w \in \mathcal{N}_*(K) \colon \|w\|_{g_*} < r\}$. On V_*^r, these Fermi coordinates yield good asymptotic expressions for the metric tensor g_*. These local expressions are then used to transition from g_1 to g_2 on annular regions about $\iota_1(K)$ and $\iota_2(K)$, in turn yielding a globally-defined metric g_ϵ on the sum, M, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

In the case of boundary and relative embeddings, however, there are two sorts of geodesics which must be used to visit all of the neighborhood V_*^r from $\iota_*(K)$ – those of g_* and those of $g_*|_{\partial M_*}$. This complicates matters and we must provide new geometric constructions and estimates for a Poisson problem with mixed Dirichlet-Neuman boundary conditions. This analysis for boundary and relative embeddings is carried out in sections 2.2 and 2.3, respectively.

3.1. Interior embeddings

Throughout this section we will only consider the case of interior embeddings; when K is closed and embedded entirely within the interior $\mathring{M}_*$. By uniformly rescaling the metrics g_1 and g_2, we may assume that

$$\exp^{g_*} : \{w \in \mathcal{N}_*(K) \colon \|w\|_{g_*} < 1\} \to M_*$$

is a diffeomorphism onto its image. For a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we will give a local description of a gluing metric g_ε on the disjoint union

$$\left(M_1 \setminus V_1^{\varepsilon^2}\right) \sqcup \left(M_2 \setminus V_2^{\varepsilon^2}\right).$$

This description will, in fact, immediately yield a globally defined metric g_ε on the above disjoint union. We will then construct the connected sum $M_1 \#_K M_2$ in such a way so that the metric g_ε descends to it.

Let $U \subset K$ be a trivializing neighborhood for the normal bundles $\mathcal{N}_1(K)$ and $\mathcal{N}_2(K)$ with local coordinates $z = (z^1, \dots, z^k)$. Denote the open unit m-ball by

$$D^m = \{x = (x^1, \dots, x^m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \colon |x| < 1\}.$$

The map

$$F_* : U \times D^m \to M_*, \quad F_*(z, x) := \exp^{g_*}_{\iota_*(z)}(x)$$

gives Fermi coordinates (z, x) on a neighborhood of $\iota_*(U)$ in M_* for $* = 1, 2$. Abusing notations, we write (z, x) for the coordinates on both M_1, M_2 and suppress the use of the bundle isomorphism in identifying the trivializations over U. These coordinates give the following local expression for the metric g_*

$$g_* = g^{(*)}_{ij} dz^i dz^j + g^{(*)}_{i\alpha} dz^i dx^\alpha + g^{(*)}_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta$$

with the well-known expansions

$$g^{(*)}_{ij}(z, x) = g^K_{ij}(z) + O(|x|), \quad g^{(*)}_{i\alpha}(z, x) = O(|x|), \quad g^{(*)}_{\alpha\beta}(z, x) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} + O(|x|^2).$$

Setting $x = \varepsilon e^{-t}\theta$ on M_1 and $x = \varepsilon e^{t}\theta$ on M_2, we introduce modified polar coordinates (z, t, θ) on a neighborhood about $\iota_*(U)$ in M_* for $* = 1, 2$ where $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$ are spherical coordinates for the unit sphere S^{m-1} and $t \in (\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon)$. Notice that t ranges between the values $\log\varepsilon$ and $-\log\varepsilon$ as $|x|$ ranges between ε^2 and 1. We define two functions $u_\varepsilon^{(1)}, u_\varepsilon^{(2)} : (\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u_\varepsilon^{(1)}(t) := \varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}} e^{-\frac{m-2}{2}t} \quad \text{and} \quad u_\varepsilon^{(2)}(t) := \varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}} e^{\frac{m-2}{2}t}.$$

Using the coordinates (z, t, θ), the local expression for g_* can be reorganized in the form

$$\begin{aligned} g_* = \; & g_{ij}^{(*)} dz^i dz^j + \left(u_\varepsilon^{(*)}\right)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \left(g_{tt}^{(*)} dt^2 + g_{\lambda\mu}^{(*)} d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + g_{t\lambda}^{(*)} dt d\theta^\lambda\right) \\ & + g_{it}^{(*)} dz^i dt + g_{i\lambda}^{(*)} dz^i d\theta^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The asymptotics now take the form

$$\begin{array}{lll} g_{ij}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = g_{ij}^{K}(z) + O(|x|), & g_{\lambda\mu}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = g_{\lambda\mu}^{(\theta)}(\theta) + O(|x|), & g_{tt}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = 1 + O(|x|^2) \\ g_{i\lambda}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|^2), & g_{it}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|^2), & g_{i\lambda}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|^2) \end{array}$$

where $g_{\lambda\mu}^{(\theta)}$ denotes a component of the standard round metric on the unit sphere S^{m-1} in the spherical coordinates $(\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$.

We are now ready to perform the interpolation between g_1 and g_2. Fix a cut-off smooth function $\xi : (\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon) \to [0, 1]$ which is non-increasing and takes the value 1 on $(\log\varepsilon, -1]$ and 0 on $[1, -\log\varepsilon)$. Similarly, let $\eta : (\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon) \to [0, 1]$ be a non-increasing, smooth function which takes the value 1 on $(\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon - 1]$ and the value 0 on $(-\log\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}, -\log\varepsilon)$.



Figure 2: The cut-off functions ξ and η

Define a function $u_\varepsilon : (\log\varepsilon, -\log\varepsilon) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u_\varepsilon(t) = \eta(t) u_\varepsilon^{(1)} + \eta(-t) u_\varepsilon^{(2)}.$$

Finally, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, define a metric g_ε by

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon(z,t,\theta) = \; & (\xi g_{ij}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{ij}^{(2)}) dz^i dz^j + u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \Big((\xi g_{tt}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{tt}^{(2)}) dt^2 \\ & + (\xi g_{\lambda\mu}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{\lambda\mu}^{(2)}) d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + (\xi g_{t\lambda}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{t\lambda}^{(2)}) dt d\theta^\lambda] \Big) \\ & + (\xi g_{it}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{it}^{(2)}) dz^i dt + (\xi g_{i\lambda}^{(1)} + (1-\xi) g_{i\lambda}^{(2)}) dz^i d\theta^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

This defines a metric g_ε on the tubular annuli

$$V_*^1 \setminus \overline{V_*^{\varepsilon^2}} = \{ y \in M_* | \varepsilon^2 < \mathrm{dist}_{g_*}(y, \iota_*(K)) < 1 \}$$

for $* = 1, 2$. We set $g_\varepsilon = g_*$ on $M_* \setminus \overline{V_*^1}$. This gives well-defined metric g_ε on the disjoint union $(M_1 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2}) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2})$.

Now we are ready to describe the generalized connected sum $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$. See Figure 4 for a picture in the boundary embedding case. Let $\Phi : \mathcal{N}_1(K) \to \mathcal{N}_2(K)$ be the isomorphism of the normal bundles given in the hypothesis of Theorem 1_a. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, consider the auxiliary fiber-wise mapping Ψ_ε given by

$$\Psi_\varepsilon : (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\}) \to (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\})$$

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(z, t, \theta) := \begin{cases} \Phi(z, -t, \theta) & \text{if } (z, t, \theta) \in \mathcal{N}_1(K) \\ \Phi^{-1}(z, -t, \theta) & \text{if } (z, t, \theta) \in \mathcal{N}_2(K). \end{cases}$$

Notice that, in the Fermi coordinates (z, x), this mapping can be expressed as $\Psi_\varepsilon(z, x) = \Phi_\varepsilon(z, \frac{\varepsilon^2}{|x|^2} x)$. We define

$$M_\varepsilon := \left((M_1 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2}) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2}) \right) / \sim_\varepsilon$$

where we introduce the equivalence relation $\sim_\varepsilon$ on the disjoint union

$$\left(V_1^1 \setminus \overline{V_1^{\varepsilon^2}} \right) \sqcup \left(V_2^1 \setminus \overline{V_2^{\varepsilon^2}} \right)$$

as follows: If $y \in V_1^1 \setminus \overline{V_1^{\varepsilon^2}}$, then $y \sim_\varepsilon (F_2 \circ \Psi_\varepsilon \circ F_1^{-1})(y)$.

Observing that g_ε is invariant under Ψ_ε, the metric descends to M_ε. We will continue to denote this metric by g_ε. Since its diffeomorphism type does not depend on ε, we will drop the subscript when referring to the generalized connected sum and simply write $M = M_\varepsilon$. This finishes the definition of the family of Riemannian manifolds (M, g_ε). The coordinates (z, t, θ) which were originally used on M_1 will continue to be used as coordinates on M. We will require a piece of notation for certain subsets of the gluing region in M: For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $a, b \geq 0$, we denote by

$$T^\varepsilon(a, b) = \{(z, t, \theta) \in M : \ \log \varepsilon + a \leq t \leq -\log \varepsilon - b\}.$$

Before we approach the problem of producing a solution to the system (1) on (M, g_ε), we will require two geometrical properties of the family $\{g_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})}$. In the present case of interior embeddings, these properties are identical to those found in [10]. Propositions 1_a and 2_a summarize the results of [10, Section 4].

Proposition 1_a. (cf. [10, Proposition 2]) *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|R_{g_\varepsilon}| \leq C \varepsilon^{-1} \cosh^{1-m}(t)$$

on $T^\varepsilon(0, 0)$ and

$$\int_M |R_{g_\varepsilon}| d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

Moreover, the constant C depends only on (K, g_K), (M_1, g_1), and (M_2, g_2).

The other feature of g_ε we will need is an ε-uniform a priori estimate for solutions of the Δ_{g_ε}-Poisson equation on the neck. Indeed, the family of operators $\{\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)}$ is not uniformly elliptic and the estimate is tailor made for the family of metrics g_ε. To state it, we will fix a family of weighting functions $\psi_\varepsilon : M \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\psi_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \varepsilon \cosh(t) & \text{on } T^\varepsilon(1, 1) \\ 1 & \text{on } M \setminus T^\varepsilon(0, 0) \end{cases}$$

and varying smoothly between the values on $T^\varepsilon(0,0) \setminus T^\varepsilon(1,1) \subset M$ (see Figure 3). For a given parameter $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$ consider the following weighted Banach spaces

$$C^0_\gamma(M) := \{v \in C^0(M) \colon \|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} := \sup_M |\psi_\varepsilon^\gamma v| < \infty\}.$$

Note that, for fixed ε, γ, the two norms $\|\cdot\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)}$ and $\sup_M |\cdot|$ are equivalent, though the equivalence is not uniform in ε.

Proposition 2_a. (cf. [10, Proposition 4]) *Given $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$, there are constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ and $C > 0$ satisfying the following statement for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}})$. If $v, f \in C^0(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))$ satisfy $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} v = f$, then*

$$v \le C\psi_\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\left(\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2} f| + \sup_{\partial T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^\gamma v|\right)$$

pointwise on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ and

$$\|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} \le C\left(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(\partial T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))}\right).$$

Moreover, the constants α_1, α_2, and C depend only on $\gamma, (K, g_K), (M_1, g_1)$, and (M_2, g_2).



Figure 3: The weighting function ψ_ε

3.2. Boundary embeddings

In this section, we consider the setting of Theorems 1_b and 2_b – when $\iota_*(K)$ lies entirely within ∂M_*. As in section 2.1, we begin by defining the family of metrics $\{g_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})}$. After uniformly rescaling the metrics g_1 and g_2, we may assume that both

$$\exp^{g_*|_{\partial M_*}} : \{w \in \mathcal{N}^\partial_*(K) \colon \|w\|_{g_*} < 1\} \to \partial M_*$$
$$\exp^{g_*} : \{w \in \mathcal{N}(\partial M_*) \colon \|w\|_{g_*} < 1\} \to M_*$$

are diffeomorphisms onto their images for $* = 1, 2$.

Let $U \subset K$ be a trivializing neighborhood for the bundles $\mathcal{N}^\partial_1(K)$ and $\mathcal{N}^\partial_2(K)$ with local coordinates $z = (z^1, \dots, z^k)$. The map

$$F'_* : U \times D^{m-1} \to \partial M_*, \quad F'_*(z, x') := \exp^{g_*|_{\partial M_*}}_{\iota_*(z)}(x')$$

gives Fermi coordinates (z, x') for the boundary ∂M_*. We denote the upper unit m-ball by

$$D^m_+ := \{(x', x^m) \in D^{m-1} \times \mathbb{R} \colon |(x', x^m)| < 1 \text{ and } x^m \ge 0\}.$$

We identify the last component of D^m_+ with the inward normal $\mathcal{N}(\partial M_*)$. Now the map

$$F_* : U \times D^m_+ \to M_*, \quad F(z, x', x^m) := \exp^{g_*}_{F'_*(z,x')}(x^m)$$

gives coordinates (z, x', x^m) on a neighborhood of $\iota_*(U)$ in M_* for $* = 1, 2$. We will write $x = (x', x^m)$ and $|x| := \sqrt{|x'|^2 + |x^m|^2}$. In the coordinates (z, x), the metric can be written as

$$g_* = g^{(*)}_{ij} dz^i dz^j + g^{(*)}_{k\gamma} dz^k dx^\gamma + g^{(*)}_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta$$

with the following well-known expansions

$$g^{(*)}_{ij}(z, x) = g^K_{ij}(z) + O(|x|), \quad g^{(*)}_{k\gamma}(z, x) = O(|x|), \quad g^{(*)}_{\alpha\beta}(z, x) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} + O(|x|).$$

We again introduce modified polar coordinates (z, t, θ) by setting $x = \varepsilon e^{-t}\theta$ on M_1 and $x = \varepsilon e^t \theta$ on M_2. Here $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$ are spherical coordinates on the unit upper hemisphere

$$S^{m-1}_+ := \{\theta \in S^{m-1} : 0 \le \theta^1 \le \frac{\pi}{4}\}$$

and $t \in (\log \varepsilon, -\log \varepsilon)$. Notice that the boundary ∂S^{m-1}_+ can be identified with the set $\{\theta \in S^{m-1} : \theta^1 = \frac{\pi}{4}\}$. Using the coordinates (z, t, θ), the local expression for g_* can be reorganized in the form

$$\begin{aligned} g_* = \; & g^{(*)}_{ij} dz^i dz^j + \left(u^{(*)}_\varepsilon\right)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \left(g^{(*)}_{tt} dt^2 + g^{(*)}_{\lambda\mu} d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + g^{(*)}_{t\lambda} dt d\theta^\lambda\right) \\ & + g^{(*)}_{it} dz^i dt + g^{(*)}_{i\lambda} dz^i d\theta^\lambda \end{aligned}$$

where $u^{(*)}_\varepsilon$ are defined as in section 2.1. The asymptotics now take the form

$$\begin{array}{lll} g^{(*)}_{ij}(z, t, \theta) = g^K_{ij}(z) + O(|x|), & g^{(*)}_{\lambda\mu}(z, t, \theta) = g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu}(\theta) + O(|x|), & g^{(*)}_{tt}(z, t, \theta) = 1 + O(|x|) \\ g^{(*)}_{i\lambda}(z, t, \theta) = O(|x|), & g^{(*)}_{it}(z, t, \theta) = O(|x|), & g^{(*)}_{i\lambda}(z, t, \theta) = O(|x|) \end{array}$$

where $g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu}$ denotes a component of the standard round metric on the upper unit hemisphere S^{m-1}_+ in the spherical coordinates $(\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$.

Using the same cutoff functions ξ and η we introduced in the case of interior embeddings, define the function u_ε as in section 2.1. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, set

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon(z, t, \theta) = \; & (\xi g^{(1)}_{ij} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{ij}) dz^i dz^j + u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \Big((\xi g^{(1)}_{tt} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{tt}) dt^2 \\ & + (\xi g^{(1)}_{\lambda\mu} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{\lambda\mu}) d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + (\xi g^{(1)}_{t\lambda} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{t\lambda}) dt d\theta^\lambda] \Big) \\ & + (\xi g^{(1)}_{it} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{it}) dz^i dt + (\xi g^{(1)}_{i\lambda} + (1 - \xi) g^{(2)}_{i\lambda}) dz^i d\theta^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

This defines a metric g_ε on the tubular annuli $V^1_* \setminus \overline{V^{\varepsilon^2}_*}$ for $* = 1, 2$. We set $g_\varepsilon = g_*$ on $M_* \setminus \overline{V^1_*}$. This gives well-defined metric g_ε on the disjoint union $(M_1 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_1) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_2)$.

Now we are ready to describe the generalized connected sum $M = M_1 \#_K M_2$. See Figure 4 for a visual description. Let $\Phi : \mathcal{N}_1(K) \to \mathcal{N}_2(K)$ be the isomorphism of the normal bundles given in the hypothesis of Theorem 1_b. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, consider mapping Ψ_ε given by

$$\Psi_\varepsilon : (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\}) \to (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\})$$

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(z, t, \theta) := \begin{cases} \Phi(z, -t, \theta) & \text{if } (z, t, \theta) \in \mathcal{N}_1(K) \\ \Phi^{-1}(z, -t, \theta) & \text{if } (z, t, \theta) \in \mathcal{N}_2(K). \end{cases}$$

We define

$$M := \left((M_1 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2}) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V_*^{\varepsilon^2})\right) / \sim_\varepsilon$$

where we introduce equivalence relation $\sim_\varepsilon$ on the disjoint union

$$\left(V_1^1 \setminus \overline{V_1^{\varepsilon^2}}\right) \sqcup \left(V_2^1 \setminus \overline{V_2^{\varepsilon^2}}\right)$$

as follows: If $y \in V_1^1 \setminus \overline{V_1^{\varepsilon^2}}$, then $y \sim_\varepsilon (F_2 \circ \Psi_\varepsilon \circ F_1^{-1})(y)$.

Observing that g_ε is invariant under Ψ_ε, the metric descends to M. This finishes the definition of the family of Riemannian manifolds (M, g_ε).



Figure 4: The construction of (M, g_ϵ) and the neck region $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$

3.2.1. The scalar and boundary mean curvatures of g_ε

The next step is to produce analogs of propositions 1_a and 2_a for the case of boundary embeddings. In addition to the estimate for the scalar curvature R_{g_ε}, we will require a similar estimate for the boundary mean curvature H_{g_ε}.

Proposition 1_b. *There is a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε, such that*

$$|R_{g_\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon^{-1} \cosh^{1-m}(t), \quad |H_{g_\varepsilon}| \leq C \cosh^{2-m}(t)$$

on $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$ *and*

$$\int_M |R_{g_\varepsilon}| d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}), \quad \int_{\partial M} |H_{g_\varepsilon}| d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

Proof. The estimate on R_{g_ε} can be obtained by an argument identical to the one found in [10] so we will only present the estimate on H_{g_ε}.

Let us first restrict our attention to the portion of $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$ where $\log \varepsilon + 1 \leq t \leq -1$. On this portion of the neck the cut off function ξ takes take the value 1 and g_ε take the form

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon(z,x) =& g^{(1)}_{ij}(z,x) dz^i dz^j + (1 + \varepsilon^{m-2}|x|^{2-m})^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta}(z,x) dx^\alpha dx^\beta \\ &+ g^{(1)}_{i\gamma}(z,x) dz^i dx^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We will drop the upper indices and write $g_{ij} = g^{(1)}_{ij}$, unless otherwise mentioned.

It will be useful to introduce a new formal parameter $\phi > 0$ and introduce the following two metrics on the neck $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$

$$\begin{aligned} g(z,x,\phi) &= g^{(1)}_{ij}(z,x) dz^i dz^j + (1+\phi)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} g^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta}(z,x) dx^\alpha dx^\beta + g^{(1)}_{i\gamma}(z,x) dz^i dx^\gamma \\ \tilde{g}(z,\phi) &= g^K_{ij}(z) dz^i dz^j + (1+\phi)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \delta_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha dx^\beta \end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\phi = \varepsilon^{m-2}|x|^{2-m}$ in the formula for $g(z,x,\phi)$, observe that we recover the gluing metric g_ε. Furthermore, we obtain the original metric g_1 if we take $\phi = 0$ in the formula for $g(z,x,\phi)$. Our goal is to compute the boundary mean curvatures of the product metrics $\tilde{g}(z,\phi)$ and $\tilde{g}(z,0)$ then compare them to the corresponding curvatures of $g(z,x,\phi)$ and $g(z,x,0)$ in order to arrive at the desired estimate.

The Taylor expansions for the metric components now take the form

$$g_{ij}(z,x,\phi) = \tilde{g}_{ij}(z,\phi) + O(|x|), \quad g_{\alpha\beta}(z,x,\phi) = \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}(z,\phi) + O(|x|), \quad g_{i\alpha}(z,x,\phi) = O(|x|)$$

Inspired by [10], it will be convenient to adopt the following variant of big-o notation.

Definition 2. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let f be a function of z, x, and ϕ. We say f belongs to the class $\mathcal{A}_a$ if

$$|f(z,x,\phi)| \leq C|x|^a \quad \text{and} \quad |f(z,x,\phi) - f(z,x,0)| \leq C|x|^a|\phi|$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

Notice that the product of an $\mathcal{A}_a$ function with an $\mathcal{A}_b$ function lies in the class $\mathcal{A}_{a+b}$. For the coefficients of the inverse of g_ϕ, we may write

$$g^{ij}(z,x,\phi) = \tilde{g}^{ij}(z,\phi) + \mathcal{A}_1, \quad g^{\alpha\beta}(z,x,\phi) = \tilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}(z,\phi) + \mathcal{A}_1, \quad g^{i\alpha}(z,x,\phi) = \mathcal{A}_1.$$

Continuing, for any derivative of a component of $g(z,x,\phi)$, we have

$$\partial_a g_{rs}(z,x,\phi) = \partial_a \tilde{g}_{rs}(z,\phi) + \mathcal{A}_0 + |\nabla\phi|\mathcal{A}_1$$

where $g_{rs}(z,x,\phi)$ may be any component of $g(z,x,\phi)$ in the coordinates (z,x) and ∂_a may be any derivative with respect to z^i $(i = 1,\dots,k)$ or x^α $(\alpha = 1,\dots,m)$. Writing Γ for a Christoffel symbol of $g(z,x,\phi)$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ for the corresponding symbol of $\tilde{g}(z,x)$, one may use the above computation with the Kozul formula to find

$$\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma} + \mathcal{A}_0 + |\nabla\phi|\mathcal{A}_1.$$

Now consider the product metric $\tilde{g}(z,\phi)$. We have $H_{\tilde{g}(z,0)} = 0$ since the boundary mean curvature of $(B^m_+(0), \delta_{\alpha\beta})$ vanishes. Using the formula for boundary mean curvature under conformal change,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\tilde{g}(z,\phi)} &= \frac{1}{2c_n}(1+\phi)^{\frac{-m}{m-2}}\partial_\nu \phi \\ &= -\frac{m-2}{2c_n}\lim_{x^m\to 0}(1+\phi)^{\frac{-m}{m-2}}\varepsilon^{m-2}|x|^{-m}(x^m) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where x^m is the last coordinate of x. Next we compute $H_{g(z,x,\phi)}$ in terms of $H_{\tilde{g}(z,\phi)}$ using the above expressions for the Christoffel symbols

$$\begin{aligned} H_{g(z,x,\phi)} &= g^{rs}(z,x,\phi)\Gamma^l_{rs}g_{lm}(z,x,\phi) \\ &= (\tilde{g}^{rs}(z,\phi)+\mathcal{A}_1)(\tilde{\Gamma}^l_{rs}+\mathcal{A}_0+|\nabla\phi|\mathcal{A}_1)(\tilde{g}_{lm}(z,\phi)+\mathcal{A}_1) \\ &= H_{\tilde{g}(z,\phi)}+\mathcal{A}_0+|\nabla\phi|\mathcal{A}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\phi = 0$ in the above equation and subtracting from $H_{g(z,x,\phi)}$ yields

$$|H_{g(z,x,\phi)} - H_{g(z,x,0)}| \le |H_{\tilde{g}(z,\phi)} - H_{\tilde{g}(z,0)}| + C_1(|\phi| + |X||\nabla\phi|)$$

for some positive constant C_1 independent of ε, coming from the definition of $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{A}_1$. Now setting $\phi = \varepsilon^{m-2}|x|^{2-m}$ and recalling that $H_{\tilde{g}(z,\phi)}$ and $H_{\tilde{g}(z,0)}$ both vanish, we find

$$|H_{g_\varepsilon} - H_{g_1}| \le C_1 e^{(m-2)t}$$

concluding our work for $t \in (\log\varepsilon + 1, -1)$.

Next, we move on to the portion $\{\log\varepsilon \le t \le \log\varepsilon + 1\}$. On this part of the neck ξ is still constant, but the normal conformal factor u_ε is effected by the cutoff function η. However, since η and its derivatives are uniformly bounded, it is straightforward to check that the estimate $|H_{g_\varepsilon}| \le C_2 e^{(m-2)t}$ holds here, where C_2 is a constant independent of epsilon.

On the portion of the neck $\{-1 \le t \le 0\}$, η vanishes and now the cutoff function ξ effects all components of g_ε. However, we can still write

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon(z,t,\theta) =& (g^{(1)}_{ij} + O(|x|))dz^i dz^j + (1+\varepsilon^{m-2}|x|^{2-m})^{\frac{4}{m-2}}(g^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta} + O(|x|))dx^\alpha dx^\beta \\ &+ (g^{(1)}_{k\gamma} + O(|x|))dz^k dx^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

In general, if two metrics are related by $g' = g + O(|X|)$, we have $\Gamma' = \Gamma + O(1)$ for any Christoffel symbol Γ' of g' and corresponding symbol Γ of g. Hence the boundary mean curvatures satisfy $|H_{g'} - H_g| = O(1)$. Applying this fact to compare g_ε and g_1, we find that the mean curvature H_{g_ε} is uniformly bounded in ε. Since t is small in absolute value on this portion of the neck, we may choose $C_3 > 0$, independent of ε, so that

$$|H_{g_\varepsilon} - H_{g_1}| \le C_3 e^{(m-2)t},$$

To summarize our efforts, for $t \in (\log\varepsilon, 0]$ and taking $C_4 = \max(C_1, C_2, C_3)$, we have

$$|H_{g_\varepsilon} - H_{g_1}| \le C_4 e^{(m-2)t}.$$

Repeating these computations for the portion of the neck $\{0 \leq t \leq -\log\varepsilon\}$, one can show that there is a constant C_5, independent of ε, satisfying

$$|H_{g_\varepsilon} - H_{g_2}| \leq C_5 e^{(2-m)t}$$

for such t. Recalling that $H_{g_*} \equiv 0$ for $* = 1, 2$, these two inequalities give the pointwise estimate claimed in Lemma 1_b where the constant is given by $C = \max(C_4, C_5)$.

We conclude the proof by using our pointwise estimate to obtain the L^1 estimate on the boundary mean curvature

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial M} |H_{g_\varepsilon}| d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} &\leq C \cdot \int_{\partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(0,0)} \cosh^{2-m}(t) d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} \\ &= C \cdot \mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)\omega_{m-2}\varepsilon^{(m-2)} \int_{\log(\varepsilon)}^{-\log(\varepsilon)} e^{(2-m)t} \cosh^{(2-m)}(t) dt \\ &\leq C' \cdot \mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)\omega_{m-2}\varepsilon^{m-2}\end{aligned}$$

where ω_{m-2} denotes the volume of the unit sphere S^{m-2} and C' is another positive constant independent of ε. □

3.2.2. Local Expression for Δ_{g_ε} and the Barrier Function ϕ_δ

Before we can state our analogue of the a priori estimate Proposition 2_a for the boundary embedding case, we will need to construct a particular barrier function. First we define a function on the unit upper hemisphere S^{m-1}_+ in spherical coordinates $\beta(\theta) := (L+1) - L\cos(\theta^1)$ where $L > 0$ is a constant to be determined. Notice that β satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_\theta \beta(\theta) = -(m-1)L\cos(\theta^1) & \text{in } S^{m-1}_+ \\ \partial_{\theta^1}\beta(\theta) = \beta(\theta) & \text{on } \partial S^{m-1}_+ \end{cases}$$

and $1 \leq \beta(\theta) \leq L+1$ in S^{m-1}_+. Now, for a fixed parameter $\delta \in (\frac{2-m}{2}, \frac{m-2}{2})$, we define the function on the gluing region by

$$\phi_\delta(z,t,\theta) := \begin{cases} \frac{\cosh^\delta(t)}{u_\varepsilon(t)}\beta(\theta) & \text{if } \delta \leq 0 \\ \frac{\cosh(\delta t)}{u_\varepsilon(t)}\beta(\theta) & \text{if } \delta \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

which is a version of the barrier function used in [10], modified for the present case of boundary embeddings. The following lemma states the key properties of ϕ_δ which we will need for the a priori estimate.

Lemma 1. *Let $\delta \in (\frac{2-m}{2}, \frac{m-2}{2})$. There exists a choice of parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$, $L > 0$, and a constant $C > 0$ so that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_\delta &\leq -C u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta \quad && \text{in } T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \\ \partial_\nu \phi_\delta &\geq \tfrac{1}{2} u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-2}{m-2}}\phi_\delta \quad && \text{on } \partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

is satisfied for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)})$.

Proof. Our first step is to obtain a useful local expression for the g_ε-Laplacian. We will only need to consider the portion of the neck $T^\varepsilon(1,1)$ where the cut off function η is constant and the components of g_ε take the form

$$\begin{aligned} g^\varepsilon_{ij} &= g^K_{ij} + O(|x|), & g^\varepsilon_{it} &= O(|x|^2) \\ g^\varepsilon_{i\lambda} &= O(|x|^2), & g^\varepsilon_{tt} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}(1 + O(|x|)) \\ g^\varepsilon_{t\lambda} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}} O(|x|), & g^\varepsilon_{\lambda\mu} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}(g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu} + O(|x|)) \end{aligned}$$

where $g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu}$ denotes a component of the standard round metric on the upper unit hemi-sphere S^{m-1}_+ in spherical coordinates $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$. As for the volume form, we have

$$\sqrt{g_\varepsilon} = \sqrt{g_K}\sqrt{g_\theta} u_\varepsilon^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}(1 + O(|x|))$$

where we write $\sqrt{g_\theta} = \sqrt{\det\left(g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu}\right)}$. One can use the above expressions with Cramer's rule to compute the following expansions for components of the inverse matrix g_ε^{-1}

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon^{ij} &= g_K^{ij} + O(|x|), & g_\varepsilon^{it} &= O(|x|^2) \\ g_\varepsilon^{i\lambda} &= O(|x|^2), & g_\varepsilon^{tt} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}(1 + O(|x|)) \\ g_\varepsilon^{t\lambda} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}} O(|x|), & g_\varepsilon^{\lambda\mu} &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}(g^{\lambda\mu}_{(\theta)} + O(|x|)). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the following general fact: for a local coordinate system $y = (y^1, \dots, y^n)$ of a Riemannian manifold (N, g), the g-Laplacian can be expressed as $\Delta_g \cdot = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_{y^a}(\sqrt{g}\, g^{ab}\partial_{y^b}\cdot)$. Using this, a straight-forward computation gives us the following expression

$$\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} = u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\left(\partial_t^2 + (m-2)\tanh\left(\frac{m-2}{2}t\right)\partial_t + \Delta_\theta + u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}\Delta_K + O(|x|)\Phi_1\right)$$

where Δ_θ is the Laplace operator of the standard round metric on S^{m-1}, Δ_K is the Laplace operator of (K, g_K), and Φ_1 is a linear second-order operator with ε-uniformly bounded coefficients. Now notice that one can conjugate Δ_{g_ε} by u_ε to find

$$\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} \cdot = u_\varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}} \mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon \cdot) \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon$ is an operator of the form

$$\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon = \partial_t^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + \Delta_\theta + u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}\Delta_K + O(|x|)\Phi_2.$$

In the above, Φ_2 is another linear second order operator with ε-uniformly bounded coefficients.

Let us first consider the case $\delta \in (\frac{2-m}{2}, 0)$. One can use the conjugation formula (2) to find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_\delta &= u_\varepsilon^{-\frac{m+2}{m-2}}\mathcal{D}_\varepsilon(\cosh^\delta(t)\beta(\theta)) \\ &= u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta\left(\delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{(m-1)L\cos(\theta^1)}{\beta(\theta)} + O(|x|) + (\delta - \delta^2)\cosh^{-2}(t)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, we have $\delta - \delta^2 \leq 0$. If we choose the positive constant $L := \frac{\left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 - \delta^2}{m}$, then the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{(m-1)L\cos(\theta^1)}{\beta(\theta)} &\leq \delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + (m-1)L \\ &< 0\end{aligned}$$

for all θ. Now, in order to deal with the above $O(|x|)$ term in the expression for $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_\delta^\partial$, observe that we can find α_1, α_2 such that

$$\delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{(m-1)L\cos(\theta^1)}{\beta(\theta)} + O(|X|) \leq \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + (m-1)L\right)$$

on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)})$. Now setting $C := \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^2 - \left(\frac{m-2}{2}\right)^2 + (m-1)L\right)$,

$$\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_\delta \leq -Cu_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta$$

on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. As similar argument for $\delta \in (0, \frac{m-2}{2})$ yields the desired estimate for $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_\delta$.

Next, we consider the outward normal derivative of ϕ_δ. Recall the following general fact: if $\{\partial_{y^1}, \ldots, \partial_{y^{n-1}}\}$ span the boundary tangent space of a Riemannian manifold (N, g) and ∂_{y^n} points outwards, then the outward normal unit vector to ∂N with respect to g is given by the formula $\frac{g^{na}\partial_{y^a}}{\sqrt{g^{nn}}}$. In our present situation, observe that $\{\partial_{z^1}, \ldots, \partial_{z^k}, \partial_t, \partial_{\theta^1}, \ldots, \partial_{\theta^{m-2}}\}$ span the tangent space of $\partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(1,1)$ and ∂_{θ^1} points outwards. Using this formula with the expressions for components of g_ε^{-1}, observe that the outward normal derivative on $\partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(1,1)$ with respect to g_ε can be written as

$$\partial_\nu = u_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{m-2}}(u_\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{m-2}}\partial_{\theta^1} + O(|X|)\Phi_3)$$

where Φ_3 is a linear first-order differential operator on $\partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(1,1)$ with ε-uniformly bounded coefficients. Applying this to the barrier function ϕ_δ, we have

$$\partial_\nu\phi_\delta = \phi_\delta u_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{m-2}}(1 + O(|x|)).$$

By choosing yet larger α_1, α_2, we may assume that the above term satisfies $1 + O(|x|) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. we may assume

$$\partial_\nu\phi_\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}u_\varepsilon^{-\frac{2}{m-2}}\phi_\delta$$

on $\partial M \cap T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)})$, as claimed. □

3.2.3. The local a priori estimate

In order to state the a priori estimate, we will decompose the boundary of the region $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ into two portions $\partial T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \cup \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &= \{(z, t, \theta) \in T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \colon t = \log\varepsilon + \alpha_1 \text{ or } t = -\log\varepsilon - \alpha_2\} \\ \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) &= \{(z, t, \theta) \in T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \colon \theta^1 = \frac{\pi}{2}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \subset M$, $\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \subset \partial M$, and the two meet at a corner.

Proposition 2$_b$. *Given $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$ there are ε-uniform constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$ and $C > 0$ satisfying the following statement for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}})$. If $v, f \in C^0(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))$ satisfy $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} v = f$, then*

$$v \leq C\psi_\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\left(\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2} f| + \sup_{\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma} v| + \sup_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}\partial_\nu v|\right)$$

pointwise on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ and

$$\|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} \leq C\left(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|\partial_\nu v\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))}\right).$$

Proof. Set $\delta = \gamma - \frac{m-2}{2}$ and let C', α_1, α_2 be the constants given by Lemma 1. Now consider the function

$$\tilde{v} = a\phi_\delta - v$$

where the constant $a > 0$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} a := \quad \max(2, C'^{-1})\Big(&\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \phi_\delta^{-1} f| + \sup_{\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\phi_\delta^{-1} v| \\ &+ \sup_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \phi_\delta^{-1}\partial_\nu v|\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to show that $\tilde{v} \geq 0$. First note that $\tilde{v}$ is superharmonic – applying the inequalities of Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\tilde{v} &\leq -aC' u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta - f \\ &\leq -u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta \sup_{T^\varepsilon_\alpha} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta^{-1} f| u - f \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also observe that $\tilde{v} \geq 0$ on $\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$. So far, we have found

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\tilde{v} &\leq 0 \quad \text{in } T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \\ \tilde{v} &\geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2). \end{aligned}$$

The maximum principle for Δ_{g_ε} tells us the minimum of $\tilde{v}$ occurs somewhere on the boundary of $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$. Suppose the minimum of $\tilde{v}$ occurs at a point $y_0 \in \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$. We may then apply the Hopf lemma and the estimate on $\partial_\nu\phi_\delta$ from Lemma 1 to obtain a contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> \partial_\nu\tilde{v}(y_0) \\ &\geq aC'\phi_\delta u_\varepsilon^{\frac{-2}{m-2}} - \partial_\nu v(y_0) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the minimum of $\tilde{v}$ must occur on $\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$. Since $\tilde{v}$ is non-negative there, $\tilde{v} \geq 0$ on all of $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} v \leq \max(2, C'^{-1})\phi_\delta\Big(&\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}}\phi_\delta^{-1} f| + \sup_{\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\phi_\delta^{-1} v| \\ &+ \sup_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{m-2}}\phi_\delta^{-1}\partial_\nu v|\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$.

One can repeat the above argument, replacing $\tilde{v}$ with $a\phi_\delta + v$, to arrive at a similar lower bound on v. Together, we arrive at

$$\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\phi_\delta^{-1} v| \leq C'\Big(\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \phi_\delta^{-1} f| + \sup_{\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\phi_\delta^{-1} v| + \sup_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |u_\varepsilon^{\frac{2}{m-2}} \phi_\delta^{-1} \partial_\nu v| \Big), \tag{4}$$

noting that the constant $\max(2, C'^{-1})$ is independent of ε.

To phrase our estimate in terms of the weighted Banach spaces C^0_γ, we need to compare the functions u_ε and ϕ_δ to the weighting functions ψ_ε. Recall the following basic fact of the hyperbolic cosine function: For every $\lambda > 0$, there is a positive constant C_λ so that

$$C_\lambda^{-1} \cosh^\lambda(s) \leq \cosh(\lambda s) \leq C_\lambda \cosh^\lambda(s)$$

holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For instance, recalling that $\psi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \cosh(t)$ on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, there is a constant C_δ depending only on δ such that

$$C_\delta^{-1} \psi_\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}-\delta} \leq \varepsilon^\delta \phi_\delta^{-1} \leq C_\delta \psi_\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}-\delta}.$$

Recalling that $\gamma = \frac{m-2}{2} - \delta$, one may replace ϕ_δ^∂ and u_ε with appropriate powers of ψ_ε to reorganize the estimates (3) and (4) to the one claimed in Lemma 2 where $C = \max(2, C'^{-1}, C_\delta)$. □

3.3. Relative embeddings

We will now consider the relative embedding case. Now K itself has non-empty boundary ∂K. Let $U \to \partial K$ be a coordinate chart for the boundary of K with coordinates $z' = (z^1, \ldots, z^{k-1})$ and, letting $z^k \in [0, 1]$ be the inward normal direction, form Fermi coordinates $z = (z', z^k)$ on a neighborhood of U in K. We will split the chart $U \times [0, 3]$ into three parts

$$U^- := U \times [0, 1], \quad U^T := U \times [1, 2], \quad U^+ := U \times [2, 3].$$

On U^+, we give Fermi coordinates given by

$$F_*^+ : U^+ \times D^m \to M_*, \quad (z, x) \mapsto \exp^{g_*}_{\iota_*(z)}(x)$$

which we originally saw in the interior embedding case from section 2.1. As for U^-, we first have boundary Fermi coordinates (z', x) for ∂M_* given by

$$F_*^\partial : U \times \{0\} \times D^m \to M_*, \quad (z', x) \mapsto \exp^{g_*|_{\partial M_*}}_{\iota_*(z')}(x).$$

Now, similar to the boundary embedding construction from section 2.2, we get coordinates on M_* by the mapping

$$F_*^- : U^- \times D^m \to M_*, \quad (z', z^k, x) \mapsto \exp^{g_*}_{F_*^\partial(z',x)}(-z^k \nu),$$

where ν is the outward-pointing normal vector to ∂M_* with respect to g_*. In order to transition between the two coordinate systems F_*^- and F_*^+, we first define a vector $V(z', x) \in T_{F_*^\partial(z',x)} M_*$ by solving the equation

$$\exp^{g_*}_{F_*^\partial(z',x)}(2V(z', x)) = F_*^+(z', 2, x).$$



Figure 5: The coordinate charts F_*^-, F_*^T, F_*^+ and the vector field V compared to the vector field $-\nu$

Now we fix a non-increasing cutoff function $\alpha : [0,3] \to [0,3]$ which takes the value 1 on $[0,1]$ and 0 on $[2,3]$ and form a transitioning normal vector by

$$\overline{\nu}(z', z^k, x) := -\nu(F_*^\partial(z', x))\alpha(z^k) + (1 - \alpha(z^k))V(z', x).$$

The coordinate system on U^T is given by the mapping

$$F_*^T : U^T \times B^m \to M_*, \quad (z', z^k, x) \mapsto \exp^{g_*}_{F_*^\partial(z',x)}(z^k \overline{\nu}(z', z^k, x)).$$

Noting that $F_*^+ = F_*^T$ when $z^k = 2$, $F_*^- = F_*^T$ when $z^k = 1$, and $z = (z', z^k)$, we have well-defined coordinates (z, x) on a neighborhood of the boundary of $\iota_*(K)$ in M_* (see Figure 5). As for an interior neighborhood of $\iota_*(K)$, we have the Fermi coordinates from section 2.1 and refer to both coordinate systems with (z, x).

On either interior or boundary charts, we introduce the coordinates (z, t, θ) by setting $x = \varepsilon e^{-t}\theta$ on M_1 and $x = \varepsilon e^{t}\theta$ on M_2. Here $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$ are spherical coordinates on the unit sphere S^{m-1} and $t \in (\log \varepsilon, -\log \varepsilon)$. The metric g_* can be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} g_* = \quad & g_{ij}^{(*)} dz^i dz^j + \left(u_\varepsilon^{(*)}\right)^{\frac{4}{m-2}} \left(g_{tt}^{(*)} dt^2 + g_{\lambda\mu}^{(*)} d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + g_{t\lambda}^{(*)} dt d\theta^\lambda\right) \\ & + g_{it}^{(*)} dz^i dt + g_{i\lambda}^{(*)} dz^i d\theta^\lambda \end{aligned}$$

where $u_\varepsilon^{(*)}$ is defined as in section 2.1. The asymptotics now take the form

$$\begin{aligned} &g_{ij}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = g_{ij}^K(z) + O(|x|), \quad g_{\lambda\mu}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = g_{\lambda\mu}^{(\theta)}(\theta) + O(|x|), \quad g_{tt}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = 1 + O(|x|) \\ &g_{i\lambda}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|), \quad g_{it}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|), \quad g_{i\lambda}^{(*)}(z,t,\theta) = O(|x|) \end{aligned}$$

where $g^{(\theta)}_{\lambda\mu}$ denotes a component of the standard round metric on S^{m-1} in the spherical coordinates $(\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{m-1})$.

Using the same cutoff functions ξ and η we introduced in the case of interior embeddings, define the function u_ε as in section 2.1. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, set

$$\begin{aligned} g_\varepsilon(z,t,\theta) = \quad & (\xi g^{(1)}_{ij} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{ij}) dz^i dz^j + u_\varepsilon^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \Big((\xi g^{(1)}_{tt} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{tt}) dt^2 \\ & + (\xi g^{(1)}_{\lambda\mu} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{\lambda\mu}) d\theta^\lambda d\theta^\mu + (\xi g^{(1)}_{t\lambda} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{t\lambda}) dt d\theta^\lambda] \Big) \\ & + (\xi g^{(1)}_{it} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{it}) dz^i dt + (\xi g^{(1)}_{i\lambda} + (1-\xi) g^{(2)}_{i\lambda}) dz^i d\theta^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

This defines a metric g_ε on the tubular annuli $V^1_* \setminus \overline{V^{\varepsilon^2}_*}$ for $* = 1, 2$. We set $g_\varepsilon = g_*$ on $M_* \setminus \overline{V^1_*}$. This gives well-defined metric g_ε on the disjoint union $(M_1 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_*) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_*)$.

Let $\Phi : \mathcal{N}_1(K) \to \mathcal{N}_2(K)$ be the isomorphism of the normal bundles given in the hypothesis of Theorem 1_c. For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, consider mapping Ψ_ε given by

$$\Psi_\varepsilon : (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\}) \to (\mathcal{N}_1(K) \setminus \{0\}) \sqcup (\mathcal{N}_2(K) \setminus \{0\})$$

$$\Psi_\varepsilon(z,t,\theta) := \begin{cases} \Phi(z,-t,\theta) & \text{if } (z,t,\theta) \in \mathcal{N}_1(K) \\ \Phi^{-1}(z,-t,\theta) & \text{if } (z,t,\theta) \in \mathcal{N}_2(K). \end{cases}$$

For each $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we construct the generalized connected sum

$$M = \left((M_1 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_1) \sqcup (M_2 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_2) \right) / \sim_\varepsilon$$

where we introduce a relation $\sim_\varepsilon$ on the annuli $(V^1_1 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_1) \sqcup (V^1_2 \setminus V^{\varepsilon^2}_2)$: If $y \in V^1_1 \setminus \overline{V^{\varepsilon^2}_1}$, then $y \sim_\varepsilon (F_2 \circ \Psi_\varepsilon \circ F_1^{-1})(y)$. Observing that g_ε is invariant under Ψ_ε, the metric descends to M. This finishes the definition of the family of Riemannian manifolds (M, g_ε).

Recalling that we assume the mean curvature H_{g_K} vanishes on ∂K, the proof of the following proposition is very similar to argument in Proposition 1_b and so we omit it.

Proposition 1_c. *There is a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε, such that*

$$|R_{g_\varepsilon}| \le C\varepsilon^{-1} \cosh^{1-m}(t), \quad |H_{g_\varepsilon}| \le C \cosh^{2-m}(t)$$

on $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$ and

$$\int_M |R_{g_\varepsilon}| d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}), \quad \int_{\partial M} |H_{g_\varepsilon}| d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

As for the local a priori estimate, we will need to again decompose the boundary of $\partial T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ into two pieces

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) &= \{(z,t,\theta) \in T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \colon t = \log\varepsilon + \alpha_1 \text{ or } t = -\log\varepsilon - \alpha_2\} \\ \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) &= \{(z,t,\theta) \in T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \colon z \in \partial K\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will use the same notation for $\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ and $\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ as we did in the case of boundary embeddings. There is also an analogue of the estimates in Propositions 2_a and 2_b for the present case of relative embeddings. Its proof is very similar to that of Proposition 2_b and we leave it to the reader.

Proposition 2_c. *Given $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$ there are ε-uniform constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$ and $C > 0$ satisfying the following statement for all $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max\{\alpha_1,\alpha_2\}})$. If $v, f \in C^0(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))$ satisfy $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} v = f$, then*

$$v \leq C\psi_\varepsilon^{-\gamma}\left(\sup_{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2} f| + \sup_{\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma} v| + \sup_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)} |\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}\partial_\nu v|\right)$$

pointwise on $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ and

$$\|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} \leq C\left(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|v\|_{C^0_\gamma(\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|\partial_\nu v\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))}\right).$$

4. The linear analysis

Now that we have constructed the generalized connected sum (M, g_ε), we will turn our attention to equation (1). At this point, there is no need to consider the interior, boundary, and relative embedding cases independently as we did in Section 2. Unless otherwise mentioned, **from now on we will speak of all three cases simultaneously.**

Our first task will be to study the family of linear operators $(\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}, \partial_\nu)$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Before we continue, now is a good time to make some informal remarks. The first non-zero Steklov eigenvalue of $(\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}, \partial_\nu)$, which we write as λ_ε, is the smallest number such that the following equation admits a non-constant solution f

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} f = 0 & \text{on } M \\ \partial_\nu f = \lambda_\varepsilon f & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

In general, $\lambda_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. For this reason, there is no general result which would provide us a useful ε-uniform $C^0(M)$ estimate for our linear problem.

This in mind, we take two measures to combat this degeneracy. In addition to working in the weighted Banach spaces $C^0_\gamma(M)$ we introduced in Section 2, we will initially solve (with estimates) a modification of the linear problem. Speaking informally, this auxiliary problem is formulated by projecting the linear problem along a hand-made model for the first non-constant eigenfunction. This model is a function denoted by β_ε which takes the values 1 on $M_1 \setminus V_1^\varepsilon$, -1 on $M_2 \setminus V_2^\varepsilon$, and interpolates between them on the neck so that $\int_M \beta_\varepsilon d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = 0$ (see Section 3.1).

Given $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$ and suitable functions $f \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)$, $\ell \in C^0_\gamma(\partial M)$, we will produce a function $u \in C^0_\gamma(M)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u = f & \text{on } M \\ \partial_\nu u = \ell - \lambda\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where λ is a real number depending on f and ℓ. Notice that the functions f, ℓ must satisfy

$$\int_M f d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = \int_{\partial M} \ell d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}, \tag{6}$$

which is simply Green's formula applied to u. We will refer to (6) as the orthogonality condition of equation (5). As we produce this solution, we also obtain an ε-uniform C^0_γ-norm a priori estimate for u using standard elliptic estimates on (M_*, g_*) with the local a priori estimate of Propositions 2_a, 2_b, and 2_c.

Before we begin, it will be useful to state a regularity result we will require later in the present section. The following theorem is a version of elliptic L^p estimate, tailored to the Neumann problem.

Theorem. cf. [13, Theorem 3.2] *Let (N, g_N) be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary ∂N. Assume that $v \in W^{k+2,p}(N, g_N)$ for some $k, p \in \mathbb{N}_0$ satisfies $\int_N v \, d\mu_{g_N} = 0$. Then there is a constant C depending only on the geometry of (N, g_N), k, and p such that*

$$\|v\|_{W^{k+2,p}(N,g_N)} \leq C \left(\|\Delta_{g_N} v\|_{W^{k,p}(N,g_N)} + \|\partial_\nu v\|_{W^{k+1,p}_{\partial}(N,g_N)} \right). \tag{7}$$

where the norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^{k,p}_{\partial}(N,g_N)}$ is defined by

$$\|F\|_{W^{k,p}_{\partial}(N,g_N)} := \inf\{\|G\|_{W^{k,p}(N,g_N)} \colon G \in W^{k,p}(N, g_N), G|_{\partial N} = F\}.$$

4.1. The linear problem I

For each $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$, let us fix ρ_1 and ρ_2, two smooth functions on $M_1 \sqcup M_2$ satisfying

$$\rho_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } M_1 \setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, 0) \\ 0 & \text{on } M_2 \setminus T^\varepsilon(0, -2\log\varepsilon - \alpha_1 - 1) \end{cases}$$

$$\rho_2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } M_2 \setminus T^\varepsilon(0, \alpha_2) \\ 0 & \text{on } M_1 \setminus T^\varepsilon(-2\log\varepsilon - \alpha_2 - 1, 0) \end{cases}$$

and $\partial_\nu \rho_1 \equiv 0$, and $\partial_\nu \rho_2 \equiv 0$ on $\partial M_1 \sqcup \partial M_2$. Understanding that ρ_1 and ρ_2 descend to the connected sum M, we then define $\beta_\varepsilon : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\beta_\varepsilon := \rho_1 - \rho_2$.

In the case of interior embeddings, where we have not altered the original metrics on the boundary, it is immediate that

$$\int_{\partial M} \beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} = 0$$

since we assume $\mathrm{Vol}_{g_1}(\partial M_1) = \mathrm{Vol}_{g_2}(\partial M_2)$. To arrange for β_ε to have vanishing average value on the boundary in the case of boundary and relative embeddings (where $d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}$ is affected by the gluing), we may have to choose α_1 and α_2 differently. However, notice that this can always be achieved by only increasing either α_1 or α_2. Since the estimate of Lemma 2 also holds for these larger parameters, **from now on we will assume that α_1 and α_2 have been chosen so that Propositions $2_a, 2_b$, and 2_c apply and $\int_{\partial M} \beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} = 0$.**

In this section we build an approximate solution to (5) which is straight-forward to estimate, but accumulates many error terms in a gluing process. This construction is summarized in the following lemma which will subsequently be applied iteratively to establish a genuine solution to the linear problem (5), with estimates.

Lemma 2. *Let $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$ and $B \in (0, 1)$. There is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the following statement is satisfied for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$: Suppose $f \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)$ and $\ell \in C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)$ satisfy*

$$\int_M f d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = \int_{\partial M} \ell d\sigma_\varepsilon.$$

Then there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, a function $u \in C^0_\gamma(M)$, and an error term $E \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u = f + E & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u = \ell - \lambda\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \\ \int_M u d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = 0 \end{cases}$$

Moreover, u, λ, and E satisfy the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} &\leq C(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}) \\ |\lambda| &\leq C(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}) \\ \|E\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} &\leq C\varepsilon^{B\gamma}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}) \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of ε and B.

Proof. First we let $\rho_T := 1 - \rho_1 - \rho_2$ so that $\{\rho_1, \rho_T, \rho_2\}$ forms a partition of unity on M. We decompose f and ℓ with respect to this partition, writting

$$f_1 = f\rho_1, \quad f_T = f\rho_T, \quad f_2 = f\rho_2,$$

$$\ell_1 = \ell\rho_1, \quad \ell_T = \ell\rho_T, \quad \ell_2 = \ell\rho_2.$$

Next, we produce an approximate solution on the neck $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$.

Claim. *For the parameters γ, B and functions f, ℓ in Lemma 2, there is a unique function $\tilde{u}_T \in C^0_\gamma(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2))$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} \tilde{u}_T = f_T & \text{in } T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \\ \tilde{u}_T = 0 & \text{on } \partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_T = \ell_T & \text{on } \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2). \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Moreover, there is a constant $C_T > 0$, independent of ε, such that

$$\|\tilde{u}_T\|_{C^0_\gamma(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} \leq C_T \left(\|f_T\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|\ell_T\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} \right).$$

Proof. Notice that $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is a compact manifold with corners. This allows us to apply the regularity theory in [8] – by [8, Theorem 1], there is a unique function

$$\tilde{u}_T \in C^2\left(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \cup \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)\right) \cap C^0(\overline{T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)})$$

solving equation (8). We may then apply Proposition $2_a, 2_b$, or 2_c with the parameter γ from the hypothesis of Lemma 2 and the function $\tilde{u}_T$ to arrive at the estimates in the claim. □

We extend the domain of $\tilde{u}_T$ to all of M, which we will continue to call $\tilde{u}_T$, by declaring $\tilde{u}_T = 0$ on $M \setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. While $\tilde{u}_T$ may not be differentiable on $\partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$, the function $u_T := \rho_T \tilde{u}_T$ is differentiable since the support of ρ_T is contained in $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2 + 1)$. One can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u_T &= f_T - q_1 - q_2 \\ \partial_\nu u_T &= \ell_T - q_1^\partial - q_2^\partial \end{aligned}$$

where $q_* := \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\rho_* \tilde{u}_T)$ and $q_*^\partial := \partial_\nu(\rho_* \tilde{u}_T)$. The quantities q_* and q_*^∂ will be accounted for in the next step.

We now turn to the pieces of M which come from the original manifolds M_*. We define λ according to the formula

$$\lambda := \frac{1}{\int_{\partial M}(\rho_1+\rho_2)d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}}\left(\int_{\partial M}(\ell\beta_\varepsilon + q_1^\partial - q_2^\partial)d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} - \int_M (f\beta_\varepsilon + q_1 - q_2)d\mu_{g_\varepsilon}\right), \tag{9}$$

which can be interpreted as the projection of f and ℓ along β_ε. Observe that, for $* = 1, 2$, this choice of λ implies

$$\int_M (f_* + q_*)d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}(\ell\rho_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_*)d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} = 0, \tag{10}$$

which we will use later.

Using standard elliptic techniques [3][13], we may consider a distributional solution $\tilde{u}_*$ to the following system

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_*}\tilde{u}_* = f_* + q_* + b_*\delta_{\iota_*} & \text{in } M_* \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_* = \ell_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_* & \text{on } \partial M_* \\ \int_M \tilde{u}_* d\mu_{g_*} = 0 \end{cases}$$

where δ_{ι_*} denotes the Dirac distribution supported on the submanifold $\iota_*(K)$. Applying Green's theorem to $\tilde{u}_*$, the constant b_* is forced to be

$$b_* = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)}\left(\int_{\partial M_*}(\ell_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_*)d\sigma_{g_*} - \int_{M_*}(f_* + q_*)d\mu_{g_*}\right).$$

Claim. *There is a constant $C' > 0$ independent of ε such that*

$$|\tilde{u}_*| \le C'(\|f\|_{C^0(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0(\partial M)})$$

on $M_* \setminus V_*^1$,

$$|\tilde{u}_*| \le C'|x|^{2-m}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)})$$

on V_*^1, and

$$|\lambda| \le C'(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}).$$

Proof. To estimate $\tilde{u}_*$, it will be useful to consider the decomposition $\tilde{u}_* = \overline{u}_* + \hat{u}_*$ where

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_*}\overline{u}_* = f_* + q_* + \mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)b_* & \text{in } M_* \\ \partial_\nu \overline{u}_* = \ell_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_* & \text{on } \partial M_* \\ \int_{M_*} \overline{u}_* d\mu_{g_*} = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_*}\hat{u}_* = -\mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)b_* + b_*\delta_{\iota_*} & \text{in } M_* \\ \partial_\nu \hat{u}_* = 0 & \text{on } \partial M_* \\ \int_{M_*} \hat{u}_* d\mu_{g_*} = 0 \end{cases}$$

One can think of $\overline{u}_*$ and $\hat{u}_*$ as the finite and Green's function parts of $\tilde{u}_*$, respectively. Near the submanifold $\iota_*(K)$, one can use the Green's function construction presented in [3] to see that $\hat{u}_*$ takes the form

$$\hat{u}_* = \frac{b_*}{(m-2)\omega_{m-1}}\left(|x|^{2-m} + O(|x|^{3-m})\right)$$

where ω_{m-1} is the volume of unit sphere S^{m-1} and the term $O(|x|^{3-m})$ depends only on the geometry of (M_*, g_*). It follows that there is a constant C_0, independent of ε, such that

$$|\hat{u}_*| \leq C_0 b_* |x|^{m-2} \tag{11}$$

on V_*^1.

Next, we consider $\overline{u}_*$. By taking $p = n$ and $k = 0$ in the L^p estimate (7) applied to $\overline{u}_*$, there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\overline{u}_*\|_{W^{2,n}(M_*,g_*)} \leq & C_1\Big(\left\|f_* + q_* - \frac{Vol_{g_K}(K)}{Vol_{g_*}(M_*)}b_*\right\|_{L^n(M_*,g_*)} \\ & + \|\ell_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_*\|_{W_\partial^{1,n}(M_*,g_*)}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for $* = 1, 2$ where C_1 depends only on n and the geometry of $(M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2)$. Now we may use the Sobolev Embedding Theorem [3, Theorem 2.30] and the Trace Theorem [13, Theorem B.10] to obtain the following C^0 estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|\overline{u}_*\|_{C^0(M_*)} \leq & C_2\Big(\left\|f_* + q_* - \frac{Vol_{g_K}(K)}{Vol_{g_*}(M_*)}b_*\right\|_{C^0(M_*)} \\ & + \|\ell_* + q_*^\partial + (-1)^*\lambda\rho_*\|_{C^0(\partial M_*)}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where C_2 is a constant depending only on n and the geometry of $(M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2)$.

To finish the proof of the claim, it suffices to estimate b_*, q_*, and q_*^∂. It will be convenient to consider the cases $* = 1, 2$ separately – in what follows, the statements will be made for $* = 1$, though analogous arguments hold for $* = 2$ and this is left to the reader. Subtracting (10) from b_1 shows

$$\begin{aligned}b_1 = & \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_{g_K}(K)}\Big(\int_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(0,0)\setminus\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,0)}(\ell_1 + q_1^\partial - \lambda\rho_1)\left(\frac{\sqrt{g_1^\partial} - \sqrt{g_\varepsilon^\partial}}{\sqrt{g_1^\partial}}\right)d\sigma_{g_1} \\ & - \int_{T^\varepsilon(0,0)\setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,0)}(f_1 + q_1)\left(\frac{\sqrt{g_1} - \sqrt{g_\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{g_1}}\right)d\mu_{g_1}\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\sqrt{g_1^\partial}$ and $\sqrt{g_\varepsilon^\partial}$ denote the Riemannian measures of $g_1|_{\partial M_1}$ and $g_\varepsilon|_{M_1}$, respectively. Notice that we only integrate over $T^\varepsilon(0,0) \setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, 0)$ since it contains the supports $\mathrm{spt}(\rho_1) \cap \mathrm{spt}(\sqrt{g_1} - \sqrt{g_\varepsilon})$. We will inspect each term in the expression (13).

On $T^\varepsilon(0,0) \setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1 + 1, 0)$, notice that $\sqrt{g_1} - \sqrt{g_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$ and on this portion of the boundary of M we have $\sqrt{g_1^\partial} - \sqrt{g_\varepsilon^\partial} = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$. Using this, we can find a constant C_3 which

depends on γ and α_1, though not on ε, such that the following inequalities hold

$$\int_{\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(0,0)\setminus\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,0)} \left|\ell_1\left(\frac{\sqrt{g_1^\partial}-\sqrt{g_\varepsilon^\partial}}{\sqrt{g_1^\partial}}\right)\right| d\sigma_{g_1} \leq C_3\varepsilon^{m-2}\|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}$$

$$\int_{T^\varepsilon(0,0)\setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,0)} \left|f_1\left(\frac{\sqrt{g_1}-\sqrt{g_\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{g_1}}\right)\right| d\mu_{g_1} \leq C_3\varepsilon^{m-2}\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)}.$$

Next we require pointwise bounds on q_1 and q_1^∂ in order to estimate (12). By definition of q_1 and q_1^∂, we have the expressions

$$q_1 = (\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_1)\tilde{u}_T + 2g_\varepsilon(\nabla\rho_1, \nabla\tilde{u}_T) + \rho_1(\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\tilde{u}_T) \quad \text{and} \quad q_1^\partial = \rho_1\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_T$$

where we have used the fact that $\partial_\nu\rho_1 \equiv 0$ on ∂M. It is worthwhile to note that the support of $\nabla\rho_1$ satisfies

$$\operatorname{spt}(\nabla\rho_1) \subset \{y \in M_1 : e^{-\alpha_1-1} \leq \operatorname{dist}_{g_1}(y, \iota_1(K)) \leq 1\},$$

which we emphasize does not depend on ε. With this and the pointwise estimates of g_ε in mind, notice that, for any α_1 and α_2, we may assume that ρ_1 has been chosen so that both $|\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_1|$ and $|\nabla\rho_1|^2_{g_\varepsilon}$ are uniformly bounded in ε. Using this observation and the estimates of Propositions 2_a, 2_b, or 2_c, one can show

$$\|(\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_1)\tilde{u}_T\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \leq C_4(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)})$$

for some C_4 independent of ε. Inspecting (8), we can find a constant C_5, depending on γ and α_1 but not ε, so that

$$\|\rho_1\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\tilde{u}_T\|_{C^0(M)} \leq C_5\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)}$$

$$\|\rho_1\partial_\nu\tilde{u}\|_{C^0(\partial M)} \leq C_5\|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}.$$

The final term we need to estimate is $g_\varepsilon(\nabla\rho_1, \nabla\tilde{u}_p)$. Let us define

$$D_{\alpha_1} := T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, 0) \setminus T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1 + 1, 0).$$

Since $\tilde{u}_p$ is a solution to a Poisson equation on the region D_{α_1}, we may apply the classical gradient estimate [3], along with the pointwise estimates of g_ε above, to find an ε-uniform constant C_6 satisfying

$$|\nabla\tilde{u}_T|^2_{g_\varepsilon}(y) \leq \frac{C_6}{\operatorname{dist}_{g_1}(y, \partial D_{\alpha_1})}(\|\tilde{u}_T\|_{C^0(D_{\alpha_1})} + \|f_T\|_{C^0(D_{\alpha_1})})$$

for all $y \in D_{\alpha_1}$. Using this estimate with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can estimate the final term in the expression for q_1

$$|g_\varepsilon(\nabla\rho_1, \nabla\tilde{u}_T)|(y) \leq C_7(\|\tilde{u}_T\|_{C^0_\gamma(D_{\alpha_1})} + \|f_T\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(D_{\alpha_1})})$$

for another ε-uniform constant C_7.

Summarizing our work so far, we have found a constant C_8, independent of ε, such that

$$q_1(y) \leq C_8(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}) \tag{14}$$

$$q_1^{\partial}(y) \leq C_8(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)})$$

for all $y \in D_{\alpha_1}$. Notice that C_8 depends only on the geometry of $(M_1, g_1), (K, g_K)$, γ, and α_1. Integrating (14) yields the desired estimate of λ from the statement of the lemma. In turn, this estimate on λ, (14), and the expression (13) gives an estimate of the form

$$|b_1| \leq e^{(m-2)t} C_9(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)})$$

Finally, recalling (11) and (12), we have arrived at the desired estimate of $|\tilde{u}_1|$. □

Now we chose cut-off functions which will be used to glue together the functions $\tilde{u}_1, u_T$, and $\tilde{u}_2$ from Claims 1 and 2. For the parameter $B \in (0,1)$ from the hypothesis of Lemma 2, let $\phi_1, \phi_2 : M \to [0,1]$ be smooth functions satisfying

$$\phi_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } M_1 \setminus T^{\varepsilon}(-B\log\varepsilon, 0) \\ 0 & \text{on } M_2 \setminus T^{\varepsilon}(0, -(2-B)\log\varepsilon - 1) \end{cases}$$

$$\phi_2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } M_1 \setminus T^{\varepsilon}(0, -B\log\varepsilon) \\ 0 & \text{on } M_2 \setminus T^{\varepsilon}(-(2-B)\log\varepsilon - 1, 0) \end{cases}$$

which are monotone in t and have vanishing normal derivatives $\partial_\nu \phi_* \equiv 0$. ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are not to be confused with the barrier functions ϕ_δ used in Section 2.2. Since $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)})$, we may have $\mathrm{spt}(\nabla\phi_*) \subset T^{\varepsilon}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. Next, we will define the approximate solution

$$u := \phi_1\tilde{u}_1 + u_T + \phi_2\tilde{u}_2.$$

Observe that claims 1 and 2, along with the choice of ϕ_*, imply the estimate on $\|u\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)}$ in Lemma 2. Our final task will be to inspect the error term.

Since the cut-off functions have vanishing normal derivative, we have

$$\partial_\nu u = \ell_1 + \ell_T + \ell_2 = \ell$$

and so we have accumulated no error term on the boundary. Moving on the the laplacian of u, it is straight-forward to compute (keeping the support of $\nabla\phi_*$ in mind)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u =& \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\phi_1\tilde{u}_1) + \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u_p + \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\phi_2\tilde{u}_2) \\ =& \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\phi_1)\tilde{u}_1 + g_\varepsilon(\nabla\phi_1, \nabla\tilde{u}_1) + \phi_1 f\rho_1 + \phi_1 q_1 + \phi_1 b_1 \delta_{\iota_1(K)} \\ &+ \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\phi_2)\tilde{u}_2 + g_\varepsilon(\nabla\phi_2, \nabla\tilde{u}_2) + \phi_2 f\rho_2 + \phi_2 q_2 + \phi_2 b_2 \delta_{\iota_2(K)} \\ &+ f\rho_T - q_1 - q_2 \\ =& f + E_1 + E_2 \end{aligned}$$

where $E_* = (\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\phi_*)\tilde{u}_* + g_\varepsilon(\nabla\phi_*, \nabla\tilde{u}_*)$. And so the error in the statement of Lemma 2 is given by $E := E_1 + E_2$.

By symmetry, it suffices to estimate the term E_1. Observe that E_1 is supported in the annular region

$$\{(z,t,\theta) \in T^{\varepsilon}(0,0) : t \in [(1-B)\log\varepsilon, (1-B)\log\varepsilon + 1]\}.$$

By a careful choice of ϕ_1 and applying the same gradient estimate used in the proof of Claim 2 (see [3] and [8]), one can find a constant C_{10}, independent of ε, such that

$$\|E_1\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} \leq C_{10}\varepsilon^{B\gamma}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}).$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2 □

4.2. The linear problem II

Lemma 2 can be refined by solving (5) without accumulating the error term E.

Lemma 3. *Let $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$. There exists a choice of parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, and a constant $C > 0$ such that the following statement is satisfied for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Given $f \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)$ and $\ell \in C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)$ satisfying $\int_M f d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = \int_{\partial M} \ell d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}$, there is a constant $\lambda = \lambda(f, \ell) \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $u \in C^0_\gamma(M)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u = f & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u = \ell - \lambda \beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \\ \int_M u \, d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = 0 \end{cases}$$

with the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} &\leq C(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \\ |\lambda| &\leq C(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the constant $C > 0$ depends only on $(M_1, g_1), (M_2, g_2), (K, g_K), \gamma$.

Proof. We will iteratively construct sequences

$$f^{(j)} \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M), \quad \ell^{(j)} \in C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M), \quad u^{(j)} \in C^0_\gamma,$$

$$\lambda^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad E^{(j)} \in C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)$$

and show they converge in appropriate senses. Setting $f^{(0)} := f$ and $\ell^{(0)} := \ell$, Lemma 2 supplies a triple $u^{(0)}, \lambda^{(0)}$, and $E^{(0)}$ solving

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u^{(0)} = f^{(0)} + E^{(0)} & \text{on } M \\ \partial_\nu u^{(0)} = \ell^{(0)} - \lambda^{(0)} \beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

with estimates. Observe the assumption on f, ℓ implies that $\int_M E^{(0)} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = 0$.

Next set $f^{(1)} := -E^{(0)}$, $\ell^{(1)} := 0$ and again apply Lemma 2 to obtain $u^{(1)}, \lambda^{(1)}$, and $E^{(1)}$ satisfying the appropriate equations and estimates. In general, for $j \geq 1$, apply Lemma 2 with $f^{(j)} = -E^{(j-1)}$, $\ell^{(j)} = 0$, and $B \in (0, 1)$ (to be chosen later) to obtain functions $u^{(j)}, \lambda^{(j)}$, and $E^{(j)}$ upon noting that $\int_M E^{(j-1)} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} = 0$. In other words, for each $j \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u^{(j)} = f^{(j)} + E^{(j)} & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u^{(j)} = -\lambda^{(j)} \beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

along with a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε and j, such that

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \|u^{(j)}\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} & \leq & C\|f^{(j)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} & \leq & C(C\varepsilon^{B\gamma})^{j-1}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \\ |\lambda^{(j)}| & \leq & C\|f^{(j)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} & \leq & C(C\varepsilon^{B\gamma})^{j-1}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \\ \|E^{(j)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} & \leq & C\varepsilon^{B\gamma}\|f^{(j)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} & \leq & (C\varepsilon^{B\gamma})^j(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \end{array}$$

Now consider the partial sums

$$v^{(N)} := \sum_{j=0}^{N} u^{(j)}, \quad \mu^{(N)} := \sum_{j=0}^{N} \lambda^{(j)}$$

and observe that only one error term remains when computing $\Delta_{g_\varepsilon} v^{(N)}$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} v^{(N)} = f + E^{(N)} & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu v^{(N)} = \ell - \mu^{(N)} \beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

Now choose $B \in (0,1)$ so that $C\varepsilon^{B\gamma}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. One can inspect the above estimates from Lemma 2 and conclude that the partial sums $v^{(N)}, \mu^{(N)}$ form Cauchy sequences in their respective Banach spaces. In fact, the error term vanishes as we take $j \to \infty$

$$\|E^{(N)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} \leq (C\varepsilon^{B\gamma})^j (\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \to 0.$$

This gives us a real number λ and a function $u \in C^0_\gamma$ such that

$$E^{(N)} \to 0, \quad v^{(N)} \to u, \quad \mu^{(N)} \to \lambda,$$

the convergence being in the appropriate space. As for the estimates of u and λ, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|v^{(N)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N} \|u^{(j)}\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N} C(C\varepsilon^{B\gamma}(\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}) \\ &\to \frac{C}{1 - C\varepsilon^{B\gamma}} (\|f\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|\ell\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}}), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the estimate in Lemma 3. The desired bound on λ follows from a similar computation. □

5. The fixed point problem

The aim of the next two sections is to finish the proofs of Theorems 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c by producing a function $\psi \in C^\infty(M)$ which solves the equation (1) on (M, g_ε) for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Since we are seeking a small conformal change to g_ε, we will write the conformal factor as $\psi = 1 + u$. In terms of u, equation (1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u = F_\varepsilon(u) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u = F^\partial_\varepsilon(u) & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where we have introduced the sort-hand notation

$$\begin{aligned} F_\varepsilon(u) &:= c_n R_{g_\varepsilon}(1+u) \\ F^\partial_\varepsilon(u) &:= 2c_n(Q(1+u)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - H_{g_\varepsilon}(1+u)) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant Q. The convergence statements in Theorem 1 will follow as consequences of our construction of u. Upon producing a solution u to (15), observe that $(1+u)^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_\varepsilon$ will be scalar-flat and have constant boundary mean curvature Q.

In what follows, for a given $\gamma \in (0, m-2)$, we will restrict our attention to $u \in C^0_\gamma(M)$ which lie in the ball of radius $r_\varepsilon := \varepsilon^{2\gamma}$ about $0 \in C^0_\gamma(M)$. We will denote this ball by $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$. Let us suppose for a moment that we have in hand a solution $u \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ to (15). Integrating by parts will tell us the mean curvature of the resulting conformal metric

$$Q = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\int_M R_{g_\varepsilon}(1+u)d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} + \int_{\partial M} H_{g_\varepsilon}(1+u)d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}}{\int_{\partial M}(1+u)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}}.$$

Using the L^1 estimates on R_{g_ε} and H_{g_ε} from Propositions 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c, one finds $|Q| = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$.

Before we solve (15), we will first use our linear analysis to establish a solution to the following projected version of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u = F_\varepsilon(u) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u = F^\partial_\varepsilon(u) - \lambda_{F_\varepsilon(u)}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Later, we will arrange for the vanishing of term $\lambda_{F_\varepsilon(u)}$, giving a genuine solution to (15).

To phrase (16) as a fixed point problem, we introduce the following maps

$$\begin{aligned} F_\varepsilon &: C^0_\gamma(M) \to C^0_{\gamma+2}(M) \times C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M), \quad v \mapsto (F_\varepsilon(v), F^\partial_\varepsilon(v)) \\ G_\varepsilon &: C^0_{\gamma+2}(M) \times C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M) \to C^0_\gamma(M), \quad (v,w) \mapsto G_\varepsilon(v,w) \end{aligned}$$

where $G_\varepsilon(v,w)$ is the solution to the boundary problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} G_\varepsilon(v,w) = v & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu G_\varepsilon(v,w) = w - \lambda_{G_\varepsilon(v,w)}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

whose existence is given by Lemma 3. Evidently, solving (16) is equivalent to finding a fixed point of the composition

$$P_\varepsilon : C^0_\gamma(M) \to C^0_\gamma(M), \quad v \mapsto G_\varepsilon(F_\varepsilon(v), F^\partial_\varepsilon(v))$$

for some γ.

Proposition 3. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. There is an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $P_\varepsilon(B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}) \subset B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.*

Proof. As usual, C_k for $k = 1, 2, 3 \ldots$ will denote positive constants independent of ε. For $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, we may apply Lemma 3 with the functions $F_\varepsilon(v), F^\partial_\varepsilon(v))$ to get a solution, $P_\varepsilon(v)$, of the linear problem along with the estimate

$$\|P_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \leq C_1 \left(\|F_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|F^\partial_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)} \right).$$

It is suffices to dominate $\|F_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)}$ and $\|F^\partial_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}$ by the product of r_ε and some positive power of ε.

We begin with the first summand. Applying Propositions 1_a, 1_b, 1_c and the definition of ψ_ε,

$$\begin{aligned}|F_\varepsilon(v)\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2}| &\leq C_2(|R_{g_\varepsilon}|\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2} + |R_{g_\varepsilon}| \cdot |v|\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2}) \\ &\leq C_3(\varepsilon^{m-2} + r_\varepsilon\varepsilon^{m-2}) \\ &\leq C_4 r_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{m-2-2\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

For the second summand in the estimate, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|F_\varepsilon^\partial(v)|\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1} &\leq C_5(\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}|Q|(1+v)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - \psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}|H_{g_\varepsilon}|(1+v)) \\ &\leq C_6\varepsilon^{m-2}r_\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Together, we have shown

$$\|P_\varepsilon\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \leq C_7 r_\varepsilon \varepsilon^{m-2-2\gamma},$$

as claimed. □

It is a good time to observe a fact we will use later – the proofs in this section hold if $|Q|$ was only $O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}})$, so long as we restrict ourselves to $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$. Now we are ready to solve (16).

Proposition 4. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. There exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, (16) has a smooth solution $u \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$.*

Proof. We will proceed by showing that the mapping P_ε is contractive on the ball $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$. In other words, we will show that there is a $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that

$$\|P_\varepsilon(u) - P_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \leq K\|u - v\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and $u, v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$. We begin by applying Lemma 3

$$\|P_\varepsilon(u) - P_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \leq C\left(\|F_\varepsilon(u) - F_\varepsilon(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(M)} + \|F_\varepsilon^\partial(u) - F_\varepsilon^\partial(v)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}\right),$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of ε. By Proposition 3, all involved terms lie in $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ for small ε.

For the first summand, keeping in mind the pointwise estimate on $|R_{g_\varepsilon}|$ from Propositions 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c, and the restriction on m, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2}|F_\varepsilon(u) - F_\varepsilon(v)| &\leq C_8\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+2}|R_{g_\varepsilon}(u-v)| \\ &\leq C_9\varepsilon\cosh^{3-m}(t)\|u-v\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} \\ &\leq C_9\varepsilon\|u-v\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)}.\end{aligned}$$

We can perform a similar estimate for the boundary term

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\varepsilon^{\gamma+1}|F_\varepsilon^\partial(u) - F_\varepsilon^\partial(v)| &= C_{10}\varepsilon\cosh(t)\psi_\varepsilon^\gamma|Q((1+u)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - (1+v)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}) - H_{g_\varepsilon}(u-v)| \\ &\leq C_{11}|Q| \cdot \|u-v\|_{C^0_\gamma(\partial M)} + C_{12}\varepsilon\cosh(t)|H_{g_\varepsilon}| \cdot \|u-v\|_{C^0_\gamma(\partial M)} \\ &\leq \|u-v\|_{C^0_\gamma}(C_{13}\varepsilon^{m-2} + C_{14}\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Since all the constants C_i are independent of ε, we can find an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ which makes P_ε a contractive mapping on $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

The Banach fixed point theorem applied to P_ε on $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ gives a fixed point of P_ε, which we call u_ε. Evidently, u_ε is a solution to equation (16), concluding the proof of Proposition 4. □

6. Vanishing of $\lambda_{F_\varepsilon(v)}$

In the last section we found, for all sufficiently small ε, a solution $u_\varepsilon \in C^0_\gamma(M)$ to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{g_\varepsilon} u_\varepsilon = F_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu u_\varepsilon = F^\partial_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \lambda_{F_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

The corresponding conformal metric $(1+u_\varepsilon)^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_\varepsilon$ will be scalar flat, but will have boundary mean curvature equal to

$$Q - \frac{1}{2c_n}(1+u)^{\frac{-n}{n-2}} \lambda_{F_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}\beta_\varepsilon$$

which is non-constant. Next, we will show that ε-small conformal changes can be made to the original metrics g_1 and g_2 before applying the gluing procedure such that, after applying the above construction and fixed point argument, the new projection term $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}$ will vanish.

Fix $\tilde{w}_1$ and $\tilde{w}_2$, two non-zero smooth functions supported on the interiors of $M_1 \setminus V_1^\varepsilon$ and $M_2 \setminus V_2^\varepsilon$, respectively. For real parameters a_* $(* = 1, 2)$ which will be chosen later, we consider the functions

$$w_* := a_* \varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}} \tilde{w}_*$$

and use them to deform the original metrics

$$\tilde{g}_* := (1 + w_*)^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_*.$$

Replacing g_1 and g_2 with $\tilde{g}_1$ and $\tilde{g}_2$ in the geometric gluing construction presented in section 3, we produce a new family of metrics $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ on the generalized connected sum M. Of course, $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ only differs from g_ε on the supports of w_1 and w_2. Keeping in mind that $\sup_M |w_*| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{n-2}{2}})$, all of the analysis we have done on the family of linear operators $(\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}, \partial_\nu)$ also holds for the new family $(\Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}, \partial_\nu)$. Namely, the proof of the a priori estimate in Lemma (3) also works for the metrics $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$. As usual, we will assume that α_1 and α_2 have be chosen so that $\int_{\partial M} \beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = 0$.

Next, we need to gather information about the new scalar curvature and boundary mean curvature. Notice that the support of $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ has three disjoint components – $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$ and the supports of w_*. Since $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ agrees with R_{g_ε} on $T^\varepsilon(0,0)$, we still have the estimate of Propositions 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c there. On the support of w_*, the formula for scalar curvature under conformal change reads

$$R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = R_{\tilde{g}_*} = -\frac{1}{c_n}(1 + w_*)^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \Delta_{g_*} w_*$$

and we conclude that $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}})$ on the supports of w_*. Hence, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}| \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}} \psi_\varepsilon^{1-m}(t).$$

As for the mean curvature of the boundary, $H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ does not differ from H_{g_ε} since w_* is supported away from the boundary.

Now, upon restricting our choice of γ to the interval $(0, \frac{1}{4})$, we may apply the fixed point argument from Section 4 to produce a solution $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon} \subset C^0_\gamma(M)$ to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \tilde{u}_\varepsilon = \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_\varepsilon = \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u) := c_n R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+u)$ and $\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(u) := 2c_n(\widetilde{Q}(1+u)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+u))$. Once this is achieved, the conformal metric $(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)^{\frac{4}{n-2}}\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ will be scalar flat and have boundary mean curvature equal to

$$\widetilde{Q} - \frac{1}{2c_n}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)^{-\frac{n}{n-2}}\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)}\beta_\varepsilon$$

where the constant $\widetilde{Q}$ can be computed by integrating by parts

$$\widetilde{Q} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\int_M R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} + \int_{\partial M} H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}}{\int_{\partial M}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}}.$$

As before, the projection term $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)}$ may be non-zero, though it now (continuously) depends on the parameters a_*. We will exploit this to establish the following proposition, concluding the proof of Theorems 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c. The following properties of the metrics $\tilde{g}_*$ will be useful in our computations later this section

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\tilde{g}_*}\cdot &= -\frac{1}{2c_n}(1+w_*)^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}g_*(\nabla w_*, \nabla\cdot) + (1+w_*)^{\frac{-4}{n-2}}\Delta_{g_*}\cdot \\ d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} &= (1+w_*)^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}d\mu_{g_\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5. *For small ε, there is a choice of the real parameters a_1 and a_2 such that the resulting rough projection $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)}$ vanishes.*

Proof. It suffices to show that the sign of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)}$ can be changed by manipulating a_1 and a_2. From the proof of Lemma 3, we may regard $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}$ as the following sum

$$\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\lambda^{(j)}_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}$$

where each term has estimate

$$|\lambda^{(j)}_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)}| \leq C(C\varepsilon^{B\gamma})^j(\|\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{C^0_\gamma(M)} + \|\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial M)}),$$

where $C > 0$ is uniform in ε. From this expression we see that the sign of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)}$, for small ε and an appropriate choice of B, is determined by the first term in the sum. We will need to recall the formula for $\lambda^{(0)}$ from the proof of Lemma 3

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{(0)} :=& \frac{1}{\int_{\partial M}(\rho_1+\rho_2)d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}}\Big(\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} + \\ &+ \int_M(\Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_1\tilde{u}_T) - \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_2\tilde{u}_T))d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}(\partial_{\tilde{\nu}}(\rho_1\tilde{u}_T) - \partial_{\tilde{\nu}}(\rho_2\tilde{u}_T))d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{u}_T$ is the solution to

$$\begin{cases}\Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}\tilde{u}_T = \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u_\varepsilon})\rho_T & \text{on } T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \\ \tilde{u}_T \equiv 0 & \text{on } \partial_1 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \\ \partial_\nu\tilde{u}_T = \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\rho_T & \text{on } \partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)\end{cases}$$

which originally appeared in the first step in the proof of Lemma 3. Next, we will inspect each of the terms in this expression for $\lambda^{(0)}$.

Unpacking the notations in the first term, we have

$$\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = c_n \int_M (R_{\tilde{g}_1} + R_{g_\varepsilon} + R_{\tilde{g}_2})(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)(\rho_1 - \rho_2) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}.$$

Recalling that $\tilde{u}_\varepsilon$ lies in $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon} \subset C^0_\gamma(M)$ and applying the pointwise estimate of R_{g_ε}, it is straightforward to show

$$\int_M R_{g_\varepsilon}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\rho_* d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = -4m\mathrm{Vol}(K)\omega_{m-1} + O(e^{-\alpha_*}\varepsilon^{m-2})$$

and

$$\int_M R_{\tilde{g}_*}\rho_* d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{c_n}\int_{M_*} |\nabla w_*|^2_{g_*} d\mu_{g_*}$$

where ω_{m-1} denotes the volume of the unit $(m-1)$-sphere.

After integrating by parts, the remaining piece of the first term can be written as

$$\int_M R_{\tilde{g}_*}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = \int_{M_*} w_* \Delta_{g_*}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon d\mu_{g_*} + \int_{\partial M_*} w_* \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_\varepsilon d\sigma_{g_*} + O(\varepsilon^{m-2+\gamma}).$$

Now we Taylor expand and rearrange the above expression for $\Delta_{\tilde{g}_*}$ and $\partial_{\tilde{\nu}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{g_*}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon =& \left(1 + \frac{4}{n-2}w_* + O(\varepsilon^{m-2})\right)\Delta_{\tilde{g}_*}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon - 2g_*(\nabla w_*, \nabla \tilde{u}_\varepsilon) + \\
&+ 2w_* g_*(\nabla w_*, \nabla \tilde{u}_\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^{m-2+2\gamma}) \\
\partial_\nu \tilde{u}_\varepsilon =& \left(1 + \frac{2}{n-2}w_* + O(\varepsilon^{m-2})\right)\partial_{\tilde{\nu}}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and multiply by w_* to find

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M R_{\tilde{g}_*}\tilde{u}_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} &= \int_{M_*} w_* \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) d\mu_{g_*} + \int_{\partial M} w_*(\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)}\beta_\varepsilon) d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} + O(\varepsilon^{m-2+\gamma}) \\
&= \int_M |\nabla w_*|^2_{g_*} d\mu_{g_*} - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)} O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}}) + O(\varepsilon^{m-2+\gamma})
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the formula for $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ in the expression for $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)$ and integrated by parts. To summarize our efforts so far, we have found

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = (c_n - 1)\left(\int_{M_1} |\nabla w_1|^2_{g_1} d\mu_{g_1} - \int_{M_2} |\nabla w_2|^2_{g_2} d\mu_{g_2}\right) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)} O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}}) + \\
+ O(e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\varepsilon^{m-2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Moving along to the next term in the expression for $\lambda^{(0)}$, we have

$$\int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = 2c_n \int_{\partial M} (\widetilde{Q}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon))(\rho_1 - \rho_2) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}.$$

Now since $H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \equiv H_{g_\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\int_{\partial M} H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\rho_* d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(e^{-\alpha_*}\varepsilon^{m-2})$$

which can be seen by computing H_{g_ε} on this portion of the neck, noting that the cut off functions ξ and η both take the value of 1 on the support of ρ_1.

Now is a good time to comment on the convergence statements in the main theorems. As we have mentioned already, we may apply the pointwise estimate of $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ and the C^0_γ-norm of $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$ to find that $\tilde{Q}$ satisfies the estimate

$$|\widetilde{Q}| = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}}).$$

Evidently, $\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}})$ on the support of w_* and $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^{(m-2)/2})$. Using the computations made in this section, one can inspect the formula for $\widetilde{Q}$ and improve our estimate to $|\widetilde{Q}| = O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$, as claimed in Theorems 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c. This can be used to estimate the remaining term in the expression for $\int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ and conclude

$$\int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)\beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\varepsilon^{m-2}). \tag{18}$$

The final two integrals in the expression for $\lambda^{(0)}$ will be treated together. Integrating by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\rho_*\tilde{u}_T)d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}\partial_\nu(\rho_*\tilde{u}_T)d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} &= \int_M (\rho_*\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\tilde{u}_T + 2(g_\varepsilon(\nabla\rho_*,\nabla\tilde{u}_T) + \tilde{u}_T\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_*) - \\ &\qquad \tilde{u}_T\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_*)d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}\rho_*\partial_\nu\tilde{u}_T d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} \\ &= \int_M \rho_*\rho_T\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon) - \tilde{u}_T\Delta_{g_\varepsilon}\rho_* d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} - \\ &\qquad \int_{\partial M}\rho_*\rho_T\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\partial_\nu\rho_* \equiv 0$. In order to proceed, will need the pointwise estimate of Propositions 2_a, 2_b, and 2_c:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_T &\leq C\psi_\varepsilon^\gamma\left(\|\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+2}(T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))} + \|\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)\|_{C^0_{\gamma+1}(\partial_2 T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1,\alpha_2))}\right) \\ &\leq C'\varepsilon^{m-2}\psi_\varepsilon^\gamma\end{aligned}$$

for $C, C' > 0$ independent of ε. Keeping in mind that $\rho_*\rho_T$ and $\Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_*)$ vanish outside of $T^\varepsilon(\alpha_1, -2\log\varepsilon - \alpha_1 - 1)$ if $* = 1$ and $T^\varepsilon(-2\log\varepsilon - \alpha_2 - 1, \alpha_2)$ if $* = 2$, one can use the pointwise estimate on $\tilde{u}_T$ to find

$$\int_M \Delta_{g_\varepsilon}(\rho_*\tilde{u}_T)d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M}\partial_\nu(\rho_*\tilde{u}_T)d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(e^{-\alpha_*}\varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

Combining the above estimates, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{(0)} =&(c_n-1)\left(\int_{M_1}|\nabla w_1|^2_{g_1}d\mu_{g_1} - \int_{M_2}|\nabla w_2|^2_{g_2}d\mu_{g_2}\right) - \\ &\lambda^{(0)}O(\varepsilon^{\frac{m-2}{2}}) + O(e^{-\max(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)}\varepsilon^{m-2}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\nabla w_*\|_{L^2} = a_* O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$, we can choose α_1, α_2 so that the term $\|\nabla w_1\|_{L^2} - \|\nabla w_2\|_{L^2}$ dominates the rest of the expression for $\lambda^{(0)}$. Evidently, one can vary the parameters a_1 and a_2 so that the sign of $\lambda^{(0)}$ – and hence the sign of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)}$ – changes. As we previously noted, $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)}$ depends continuously on a_1 and a_2, so we conclude that there are suitable values of a_1 and a_2 for which the projection term $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon)}$ vanishes. This finishes the proof of Theorems 1_a, 1_b, and 1_c. □

7. The non-critical case

So far, we have produced a family of metrics $(1+\tilde{u}_\varepsilon)^{\frac{4}{n-2}}\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ on M, each scalar-flat and having constant boundary mean curvature of size $O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$. In this section we will prove Theorems 2_a, 2_b, and 2_c, where we arrange for this mean curvature to vanish entirely. To achieve this, we will need yet another alteration to the above construction. From now on, we assume that neither of the original manifolds are Ricci-flat with totally geodesic boundary , i.e. we assume that $\max(\sup_{M_*}|Ric_{g_*}|, \sup_{\partial M_*}|A_{g_*}|) > 0$ for both $* = 1$ and 2.

Let S_* be a positive-definite symmetric 2-tensor with

$$\mathrm{spt}(S_*) \subset \left((M_* \setminus \iota_*^1) \cap (\mathrm{spt}(Ric_{g_*}) \cup \mathrm{spt}(A_{g_*}))\right).$$

For a real parameter $\tilde{r}_*$, set $r_* := \tilde{r}_* \varepsilon^{m-2}$ and consider the following variation of g_ε

$$\tilde{g}_\varepsilon := g_\varepsilon + r_1 S_1 + r_2 S_2, \quad \tilde{g}_* := g_* + r_* S_*,$$

not to be confused with the conformal modifications made in section 6.

We apply the constructions of sections 4 and 5 to $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ in order to produce a family of solutions, $v = v_\varepsilon(r_1, r_2) \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} v = \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu v = \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v,r_1,r_2)}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) := c_n R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+v)$$

is defined as usual, but

$$\tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) := -2c_n H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+v)$$

has been altered so that, supposing we can arrange for $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v,r_1,r_2)} = 0$, the boundary mean curvature of $(1+v)^{\frac{4}{n-2}}\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$ is exactly 0. As before, we will assume that $\int_{\partial M}\beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = 0$, which can be achieved for any r_1 and r_2 by an appropriate choice of α_1 and α_2.

Notice that our choice of r_* ensures $R_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$ satisfies the same pointwise bounds as in the previous sections. This will allow us to apply the results of sections 4 and 5 with trivial modifications once we verify

$$\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = \int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}. \tag{19}$$

The second and final step is to arrange for the vanishing of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v,r_1,r_2)}$.

Let us take a moment to explain why simultaneous vanishing of the Ricci tensor and second fundamental form can potentially be an obstruction to achieving the conclusions of theorem B. Briefly, (M, g_ε) may be in the same conformal class as an Einstein metric with Neumann boundary conditions in the sense of [1] and the total scalar curvature plus mean curvature functional

$Q(g_\varepsilon)$ may stable under even non-conformal perturbations. For the metric $\tilde{g}_\varepsilon$, we can follow the calculations of [2] to compute

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\tilde{g}_\varepsilon) &= Q(g_\varepsilon) + 2c_n \sum_{*=1}^{2} r_* \left(\int_M g_*(S_*, Ric_{g_*}) d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M} g_*(S_*, A_{g_*}) d\sigma_{g_*} \right) + \\ &\quad O(r_1^2) + O(r_2^2) \\ &= Q(g_\varepsilon) + 2c_n \sum_{*=1}^{2} r_* \left(\int_M K_* d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M} K_*^\partial d\sigma_{g_*} \right) + O(\varepsilon^{2(m-2)}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the notation $K_* := g_*(S_*, Ric_{g_*})$ and $K_*^\partial := g_*(S_*, A_{g_*})$.

From this formula, we can see that if both Ric_{g_*} and A_{g_*} vanish identically for $* = 1$ and 2, the first variation of $Q(g_\varepsilon)$ vanishes for all choices of S_* and we will be unable to correct the term $F(g_\varepsilon)$ with a small (relative to ε) perturbation of g_ε away from the gluing locus to achieve the desired vanishing mean curvature. This reasoning heuristically explains why our construction may fail to produce scalar-flat metrics with vanishing boundary mean curvature on M without assumptions on the Ricci tensor and second fundamental form.

7.1. Achieving the orthogonality condition

In this subsection, we will give a description of the values r_1 and r_2 for which (19) is satisfied.

Proposition 6. *For small ε and $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, there is a smooth function f_v defined on a neighborhood $\overline{U}$ of $\frac{\varepsilon^{m-2}}{2}$ such that*

$$\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1, f_v(r_1)) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = \int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}_\varepsilon^\partial(v, r_1, f_v(r_1)) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}$$

for all $r_1 \in \overline{U}$.

Proof. For any $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon} \subset C^0_\gamma(M)$, we introduce the function

$$\begin{aligned} G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1, r_2) :=& \frac{1}{c_n} \Big(\int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1, r_2) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}_\varepsilon^\partial(v, r_1, r_2) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \Big) \\ &= \int_M R_{g_\varepsilon} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} + 2 \int_{\partial M} H_{g_\varepsilon} d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} + \sum_{*=1,2} r_* \left(\int_{M_1} K_* d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M_*} K_*^\partial d\sigma_{g_*} \right) \\ &\quad + L_v(r_1, r_2) + Q_v(r_1, r_2) \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the notation

$$\begin{aligned} L_v(r_1, r_2) :=& \int_M v R_{g_\varepsilon} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} + \sum_{*=1,2} r_* \left(\int_{M_*} v K_* d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M_*} v K_*^\partial d\sigma_{g_*} \right) - 2 \int_{\partial M_*} v H_{g_\varepsilon} d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} \\ Q_v(r_1, r_2) :=& \sum_{*=1,2} \int_{M_*} R_{\tilde{g}_*}(1+v) d\mu_{g_*} - 2 \int_{\partial M_*} H_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(1+v) \\ &- r_* \int_{M_*} K_*(1+v) d\mu_{g_*} + r_* \int_{\partial M_*} K_*^\partial (1+v) d\sigma_{g_*} + O(\varepsilon^{2(m-2)}). \end{aligned}$$

L_v and Q_v can be interpreted as the linear and quadratic parts, respectively, of $G_{v,\varepsilon}$. We also introduce the function $H_\varepsilon(r_1, r_2) := G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1, r_2) - L_v(r_1, r_2) - Q_v(r_2, r_2)$.

For simplicity, we will pick S_* to satisfying the following conditions. We assume that S_* has been chosen so that $\int_M K_* d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M_*} K_*^\partial d\sigma_{g_*} = 1$ and we will only consider the case when

$$\int_M R_{g_\varepsilon} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} + 2\int_{\partial M} H_{g_\varepsilon} d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} < 0,$$

though the argument is very similar if this quantity is positive. Since this term is $O(\varepsilon^{m-2})$, we will scale the metric g_ε so that it is equal to $-\varepsilon^{m-2}$. Now H_ε takes the form

$$H_\varepsilon(r_1, r_2) = -\varepsilon^{m-2} + r_1 + r_2$$

and the vanishing locus of $H_\varepsilon(r_1, r_2)$ is given by $\{(r_1, r_2) : r_1 + r_2 = \varepsilon^{m-2}\}$. We will see that the zero set of $G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1, r_2)$ is uniformly close to this set.

It is straight forward to check that there is a constant $C > 0$, independent of ε and $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, such that

$$L_v(r_1, r_2), Q_v(r_1, r_2) \le C_1 \varepsilon^{m-2+\gamma}.$$

So, for any $\eta > 0$, there is sufficiently small ε so that

$$|L_v(r_1, r_2)|, |Q_v(r_1, r_2)| \le \frac{\eta}{2}\varepsilon^{m-2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\{G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1, r_2) = 0\} &= \{(r_1, r_2) : r_1 + r_2 = \varepsilon^{m-2} - L_v(r_1, r_2) - Q_v(r_1, r_2)\} \\ &\subset \{(r_1, r_2) : (1-\eta)\varepsilon^{m-2} \le r_1 + r_2 \le (1+\eta)\varepsilon^{m-2}\} =: Z_\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

From these remarks, we can find many zeroes of $G_{v,\varepsilon}$. For instance, setting $r_1' := \varepsilon^{m-2}/2$, for any $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, there is a number $r_2' = r_2'(v)$ with $(r_1', r_2'(v)) \in Z_\varepsilon$ and $G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1', r_2'(v)) = 0$. However, we will still need a degree of freedom to arrange for $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon} = 0$ in the next subsection. Fortunately, for each $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ we will find a 1-parameter family of solutions near (r_1', r_2') by applying the implicit function theorem to $G_{v,\varepsilon}$.

Computing the derivatives of $G_{\varepsilon,v}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial r_*} G_{\varepsilon,v}(0,0)\right| &= \left|\int_{M_*} K_*(1+v) d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M_*} K_*^\partial (1+v) d\sigma_{g_*}\right| \\ &\ge \left|\int_{M_*} K_* d\mu_{g_*} - \int_{\partial M_*} K_*^\partial d\sigma_{g_*}\right| \\ &\qquad - \|v\|_{C^0(M)}\left(\int_{M_*} |K_*| d\mu_{g_*} + \int_{\partial M_*} |K_*^\partial| d\sigma_{g_*}\right) \\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}\end{aligned}$$

for $* = 1, 2$ and all $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$. From this we can find a radius $R > 0$, uniform in ε and $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, so that that $\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial r_*} G_{v,\varepsilon}\right| \ge \frac{1}{4}$ on $B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

After perhaps restricting to smaller ε, the set $Z_\varepsilon \cap \{r_1, r_2 \ge 0\}$ is contained in $B_R(0)$. We may now apply the implicit function theorem on $G_{v,\varepsilon}$ about the points $(r_1', r_2'(v))$ to obtain, for every



Figure 6: The region Z_ε (in blue) and the function f_v in the r_1r_2-plane.

$v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$, open neighborhoods $U(v)$ and $V(v)$ containing r_1' and $r_2'(v)$, respectively, and a function $f_v : U(v) \to V(v)$ so that $G_{v,\varepsilon}(r_1, f_v(r_1)) = 0$ for all $r \in U(v)$ (see Figure 6). In fact, we know apriori that f_v can be extended to the interval $(0, (1-\eta)\varepsilon^{m-2})$, and so we may choose open sets U and V which are independent of $v \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$. Since the graph of each f_v lies in Z_ε they may be extended to $f_v : \overline{U} \to \overline{V}$. □

Before we continue, we will need one more property of the family $\{f_v\}_{v\in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}}$. By construction, we have

$$f_v(r_1) = \int_M R_{g_\varepsilon} d\mu_{g_\varepsilon} + 2\int_{\partial M} H_{g_\varepsilon}(1+v) d\sigma_{g_\varepsilon} - r_1 + L_v(r_1, f_v(r_1)) + Q_v(r_1, r_2).$$

From this one can see, for small ε and any $r_1, r_1' \in \overline{U}$, that

$$|f_v(r_1) - f_v(r_1')| \le 4|r_1 - r_1'|.$$

Now Ascoli-Arzela tells us that $\{f_v\}_{v\in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}}$ is precompact in the $C^0(\overline{U})$ norm. This function f will have the same Lipschitz norm bound.

7.2. Vanishing of the rough projection

Paralleling section 4, we introduce the map $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon : C^0_\gamma(M) \to C^0_\gamma(M)$ sending a function v to the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(v) = \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v, r_1', f_v(r_1')) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{P}_\varepsilon(v) = \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(v, r_1', f_v(r_1')) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(v,r_1',f_v(r_1'))}\beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

The arguments of that section can be repeated to show $\tilde{P}_\varepsilon$ is also a contraction mapping on $B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ for small ε and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$. This shows that $\{(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon)^j(0)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ converges to a fixed point $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon \in B^\gamma_{r_\varepsilon}$ with

respect to the C^0_γ-norm. From the previous section, after passing to a subsequence, the functions $f_{(\tilde{P}_\varepsilon)^j(0)}$ also converge to a continuous function $f : \overline{U} \to \overline{V}$ which verifies the orthogonality condition for $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$. We conclude that, for any $r_1 \in \overline{U}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \tilde{v}_\varepsilon = \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu \tilde{v}_\varepsilon = \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) - \lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1))} \beta_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

The following proposition will complete the proof of Theorems $2_a, 2_b$, and 2_c.

Proposition 7. *There exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there is a choice of $r_1 \in \overline{U}$ for which $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1))}$ vanishes where $\tilde{v}_\varepsilon$ is given by (20).*

Proof. Since $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1))}$ is continuous in r_1, it suffices to show that its sign can be controlled by $r_1 \in \overline{U}$. Following section 5, for small ε, the sign of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1))}$ is controlled by the sign of

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{(0)} = \frac{1}{\int_{\partial M} (\rho_1 + \rho_2) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}} \Big(& \int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) \beta_\varepsilon d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \\ & - \int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) \beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} + \int_M (\Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_1 \tilde{u}_T) \\ & - \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_2 \tilde{u}_T)) d_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} - \int_{\partial M} \partial_\nu(\rho_1 \tilde{u}_T) - \partial_\nu(\rho_2 \tilde{U}_T) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} \Big). \end{aligned}$$

As before, we have

$$\int_M \Delta_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon}(\rho_* \tilde{u}^\varepsilon_p) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} + \int_{\partial M} \partial_\nu(\rho_* \tilde{u}_T) d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = O(e^{-\alpha_*} \varepsilon^{m-2})$$

for $* = 1, 2$. For the first term appearing in the above expression for $\lambda^{(0)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c_n} \int_M \tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) d\mu_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} &= r_1 \int_{M_1} K_1 d\mu_{g_1} - f(r_1) \int_{M_2} K_2 d\mu_{g_2} \\ &\quad + \int_M R_{g_\varepsilon} \beta_\varepsilon dvol_{g_\varepsilon} + O(\varepsilon^{m-2+2\gamma}) \\ &= r_1 \int_{M_1} K_1 d\mu_{g_1} - f(r_1) \int_{M_2} K_2 d\mu_{g_2} + O(e^{-\min(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \varepsilon^{m-2}) \end{aligned}$$

The boundary term has a similar estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c_n} \int_{\partial M} \tilde{F}^\partial_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1)) \beta_\varepsilon d\sigma_{\tilde{g}_\varepsilon} = & - r_1 \int_{\partial M_1} K^\partial_1 d\sigma_{g_1} + f(r_1) \int_{\partial M_2} K^\partial_2 d\sigma_{g_2} \\ & + O(e^{-\min(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \varepsilon^{m-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing these three expressions together gives us the expression we are looking for

$$\lambda^{(0)} = r_1 - f(r_1) + O(e^{-\max(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)} \varepsilon^{m-2}).$$

Hence, we can choose large α_1 and α_2 so that the sign of $\lambda_{\tilde{F}_\varepsilon(\tilde{v}_\varepsilon, r_1, f(r_1))}$ is controlled by $r_1 - f(r_1)$. Evidently, the graph of f must intersect the line $\{r_1 = r_2\}$ in Z_ε (see Figure 6) and we conclude that the sign of $r_1 - f(r_1)$ changes as r_1 varies over $\overline{U}$, finishing the proof of Proposition 7. □

References

References

[1] Anderson, M. T., 2008. On boundary value problems for Einstein metrics. Geom. Topol. 12 (4), 2009–2045.
[2] Araújo, H., 2003. Critical points of the total scalar curvature plus total mean curvature functional. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 52 (1), 85–107.
[3] Aubin, T., 1998. Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
[4] Escobar, J. F., 1992. Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a scalar flat metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary. Ann. of Math. (2) 136 (1), 1–50.
[5] Escobar, J. F., 1992. The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary. J. Differential Geom. 35 (1), 21–84.
[6] Escobar, J. F., 1996. Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a constant scalar curvature metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 45 (4), 917–943.
[7] Joyce, D., 2003. Constant scalar curvature metrics on connected sums. Int. J. Math. Math. Sci. (7), 405–450.
[8] Lieberman, G. M., 1986. Mixed boundary value problems for elliptic and parabolic differential equations of second order. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 113 (2), 422–440.
[9] Mazzeo, R., Pollack, D., Uhlenbeck, K., 1995. Connected sum constructions for constant scalar curvature metrics. Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 6 (2), 207–233.
[10] Mazzieri, L., 2008. Generalized connected sum construction for nonzero constant scalar curvature metrics. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 33 (1-3), 1–17.
[11] Mazzieri, L., 2009. Generalized connected sum construction for scalar flat metrics. Manuscripta Math. 129 (2), 137–168.
[12] Schoen, R., 1984. Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature. J. Differential Geom. 20 (2), 479–495.
[13] Wehrheim, K., 2004. Uhlenbeck compactness. EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich.